DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 041 597 LI 001 887

AUTHOR	Kleiner, Jane P., Ed.
TITLE	Proceedings of the Institute for Advanced Study in Librarianship on the Concept of Systems of Libraries with Special Application to Louisiana...Oct 26-31, 1969.
INSTITUTION	Louisiana State Univ., Baton Rouge. Library School.
PUB DATE	69
NOTE	127p.
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF-$0.50 HC-$6.45
DESCRIPTORS	Information Systems, *Library Cooperation, *Library Planning, *Library Programs, Library Services, *School Libraries, *State Libraries
IDENTIFIERS	*Louisiana

ABSTRACT

The objectives of the institute were: (1) to explore in general the concept of library systems and study in depth its application in a number and variety of programs; (2) to consider how the systems concept can be embodied in future plans for library development in Louisiana and provide opportunities for participants from other states to become more acquainted with the systems concept for applications in their own states and (3) to identify and develop plans for improving library, media and information programs of Louisiana through library systems for interlibrary cooperation and to establish priorities and coordinate efforts through statewide planning. Papers given include: (1) Black Gold Cooperative Library System (California), (2) Library Systems Services to Youth, (3) Academic Library Cooperation, (4) The Academic Library in Relation to the System, (5) A Louisiana Library System: focus on funding, and (6) A Louisiana Library System: focus on the user. These are followed by: a designation of library systems, group discussions by proposed systems, reports from type of library study groups, implications of the institute for statewide library development, a list of the institute primary resources and the institute personnel. Space limitations require these proceedings to present only a summarized version of the activities. (NH)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

ED041597

INSTITUTE FOR ADVANCED STUDY IN LIBRARIANSHIP

PROCEEDINGS OF THE INSTITUTE ON THE CONCEPT OF SYSTEMS OF LIBRARIES WITH SPECIAL APPLICATION TO LOUISIANA

Sponsored by
The Louisiana State University Library School
At Baton Rouge 26 October-31 October 1969
And Directed by
Dr. Shirley K. Stephenson
Institute Director

Edited by
Jane P. Kleiner

LI 001887

PREFACE

The Louisiana State University Library School conducted an Institute on The Concept of Systems of Libraries with Special Application to Louisiana in the University's Continuing Education Center, Pleasant Hall, Baton Rouge, Louisiana, on October 27 through October 31, 1969. The Institute was conducted under a grant from the U.S. Office of Education, Title II-B, Higher Education Act of 1965, P.L. 89-329, as amended.

The information reported in this volume was performed pursuant to the grant. However, opinions expressed herein do not necessarily reflect the position or policy of the U.S. Office of Education, and no official endorsement by that office should be inferred.

Due to space limitations, the following work is only meant to present a summarized version of the week's activities. Neither space nor time permitted a word by word account of the proceedings.

The papers included here were presented during the Institute by the contributors cited. However, all have been heavily edited, and portions of the discussions have been deleted due to space requirements. In some cases, the speeches have been rearranged. This has been done with the hope that the speakers will bear with our presentation as time limitations have not permitted them to examine, alter or approve the versions herein.

The editor is well aware that occasional errors in meaning or possibly even distortions of meanings may have occurred. However, every effort has been made to present the thoughts and ideas of the speakers in their intended context. Should errors have occurred, though unintentionally, the editor has taken the prerogative of depending on the graciousness of the Institute contributors in accepting advance apologies.

Considerable gratitude is expressed to those contributors who provided finished papers of their addresses. A large measure of appreciation is also due Dr. Shirley K. Stephenson, Institute Director, for her advice and cooperation in the preparation of these proceedings. In addition, the editor wishes to recognize Mrs. Mary H. Alston for her assistance in preparing the final document for printing.

Lastly, in reference to the heavy editing of these proceedings, it is hoped the reader is aware that under the circumstances, effective publication of the addresses and events could not have occurred in any other form.

J.P.K.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

PREFACE-- i

INTRODUCTION--- 1

PROGRAM-- 3

OBJECTIVES OF THE INSTITUTE-------------------------------- 7

KEYNOTE ADDRESS-- 9
Charles Nelson

BLACK GOLD COOPERATIVE LIBRARY SYSTEM---------------------- 23
Catherine S. Chadwick

LIBRARY SYSTEMS SERVICES TO YOUTH-------------------------- 35
Isobel P. Lynch

ACADEMIC LIBRARY COOPERATION------------------------------- 49
Stephen A. McCarthy

THE ACADEMIC LIBRARY IN RELATION TO THE SYSTEM------------- 65
Catherine S. Chadwick

A LOUISIANA LIBRARY SYSTEM: FOCUS ON FUNDING--------------- 71
S. Janice Kee

A LOUISIANA LIBRARY SYSTEM: FOCUS ON THE USER-------------- 89
Peter Hiatt

DESIGNATION OF LIBRARY SYSTEMS----------------------------- 99

GROUP DISCUSSIONS BY PROPOSED SYSTEMS---------------------- 101
- Proposed Northeast System-------------------------------- 102
- Proposed Northwest System-------------------------------- 104
- Proposed Southeast System-------------------------------- 106
- Proposed Capital System---------------------------------- 107
- Proposed Central System---------------------------------- 108
- Proposed South Central System---------------------------- 109
- Proposed Southwest System-------------------------------- 110

REPORTS FROM TYPE OF LIBRARY STUDY GROUPS------------------ 113
- Public Libraries--- 113
- School Libraries or Media Centers------------------------ 114
- Academic Libraries--------------------------------------- 114
- Special Libraries-- 116
- Louisiana State Library---------------------------------- 116

IMPLICATIONS OF THE INSTITUTE FOR STATEWIDE LIBRARY DEVELOPMENT-- 121

INSTITUTE PRIMARY RESOURCES-------------------------------- 123

INSTITUTE PERSONNEL-- 125
- Administrative Staff------------------------------------- 125
- Clerical Staff--- 126
- Consultants and Speakers--------------------------------- 126
- Discussion Leaders and Recorders------------------------- 128
- Institute Observers, Recorders and Resource Personnel----- 128
- Institute Participants----------------------------------- 129

INTRODUCTION

The proposal for the Louisiana State University Library School Institute dealing with systems development stemmed from two significant milestones in the history of statewide library development in Louisiana. First, the Louisiana State Library, using the demonstration method of library development, achieved its goal of providing public library service throughout Louisiana with the inauguration of the Jefferson Davis Parish Library Demonstration on October 20, 1968. Secondly, the critical survey of Louisiana's library services and needs conducted by John and James Humphry, entitled Library Service in Louisiana: Keeping Pace with Progress in the State, was formally presented to the Louisiana Library Association during the annual LLA conference held in 1968.

A year of study of the Humphry report and recommendations for statewide library development on a broad systems basis engaged the attention of the Library Development Committee of the Louisiana Library Association and involved administrators and policy making personnel of all types of libraries during the period following the 1968 conference. Recommendations concerning forms of library cooperation and a request for the Louisiana State Library to support a pilot project to test and demonstrate aspects of library system development were approved at the 1969 annual conference of the Louisiana Library Association.

The Library School Institute was held at the University's Continuing Education Center during the last week of October, 1969. In general, the librarians throughout Louisiana had achieved positive attitudes toward changing patterns of library development. Increasing open-mindedness on the part of the library profession and the trustees with policy making responsibilities was also in evidence. The Institute provided the opportunity and the impetus for Louisiana librarians and representatives of neighboring state library development programs to think constructively, to seek new and innovative plans for library cooperation, and to profit from the challenges, admonitions, advice and recommendations of knowledgeable speakers and consultants.

The registration of 98 official participants was augmented by the involvement of observers, recorders and resource personnel, including eight members of the staff of the Louisiana State Library involved in administrative responsibilities. Other official observers included the chairman of the Library Development Committee of the Louisiana Library Association, the librarian of the U.S. Department of Agriculture Southern Utilization Research and Development Division Library in New Orleans, and a library consultant from the Louisiana State Department of Education.

The evaluation of this Institute by these participants has indicated an overwhelmingly favorable response to the week's activities. The reports of the study groups included herein contain excellent plans for future activities.

Exemplifying the effectiveness of the Institute is the fact that plans for future library development were initiated during the week's sessions, and the programs of follow-up study and action have continued to gain strength and momentum since the conclusion of the Institute on October 31, 1969.

It is hoped that momentum in the library development in the state will continue to gather force in order that librarians throughout Louisiana may carry out the plans for improved statewide service formulated during the week of the Institute.

LSU LIBRARY SCHOOL
INSTITUTE FOR ADVANCED STUDY IN LIBRARIANSHIP
on
"The Concept of Systems of Libraries
with Special Application to Louisiana"

PROGRAM

Sunday, October 26, 1969

7:00-8:30 P.M.----------- Informal Reception, Staff Lounge, Room 281, LSU Library. Distribution of Packets.

7:30 & 8:15 P.M.--------- Film Showings, "Challenge of Change." Room 230C

8:30-9:00 P.M.----------- Orientation of Discussion Leaders and Recorders, Miss Casey and Consultants. Room 230A, LSU Library.

Monday, October 27, 1969 Pleasant Hall, Room 130. Mrs. Florrinell F. Morton, presiding.

8:30-9:30 A.M.----------- Greetings from Mrs. Florrinell F. Morton, Director, LSU Library School.

Introduction of Staff by Dr. Shirley K. Stephenson, Director of the Institute.

"Objectives of the Institute," by Miss Genevieve Casey, Program Consultant and Coordinator.

9:30-10:00 A.M.---------- Coffee

10:00-11:30 A.M.--------- Keynote Address by Mr. Charles Nelson, Principal of Peat, Marwick, Mitchell & Company, New York City.

1:00-3:00 P.M.----------- Dr. Shirley K. Stephenson, presiding. "Challenge to the Institute: The Process of Planning," by Miss Genevieve Casey, Associate Professor, Department of Library Science, Wayne State University, Detroit, Michigan, and Institute Program Coordinator.

3:00-3:30 P.M.----------- Coffee

3:30-4:30 P.M.----------- Group Discussions by Proposed Systems. Pleasant Hall Room Assignments:

Southeast	Room #154
South Central	Room # 38
Northeast	Room # 59
Central	Room #130 N.W.
Capital	Room #130 S.
Southwest	Room # 50
Northwest	Room #130 N.E.

Tuesday, October 28, 1969 Pleasant Hall, Room 130.
Miss Sallie Farrell, presiding.

8:30-10:00 A.M.---------- "Case Study: Black Gold Cooperative Library System (California)," by Mrs. Catherine S. Chadwick, Director of Library Services.

10:00-10:30 A.M.--------- Coffee

10:30-11:45 A.M.--------- Group Discussions by Proposed Systems. (See Pleasant Hall Room Assignments, above)

1:00-2:30 P.M.----------- Miss Norris McClellan, presiding. "Library System Services to Youth," by Miss Isobel P. Lynch, Supervisor, Interlibrary Cooperation and Planning Division of Library Extension, Maryland State Department of Education.

2:30-3:00 P.M.----------- Coffee

3:00-4:30 P.M.----------- Discussion Groups by Proposed Systems. (See Pleasant Hall Room Assignments, above)

Wednesday, October 29, 1969 Pleasant Hall, Room 130.
Mr. John Richard, presiding.

8:30-10:00 A.M.---------- "Academic Library Cooperation," by Dr. Stephen A. McCarthy, Executive Director, Association of Research Libraries, Washington, D.C.

10:00-10:30 A.M.--------- Coffee

10:30-11:30 A.M.--------- "The Academic Library in Relation to the System," by Mrs. Catherine S. Chadwick.

1:00-2:30 P.M.----------- Miss Vivian Cazayoux, presiding. "A Louisiana Library System: Focus on Funding," by Miss S. Janice Kee, Library Services Program Officer, Bureau of Adult, Vocational and Library Programs, USOE Region VII: Arkansas, Louisiana, New Mexico, Oklahoma and Texas, Dallas, Texas.

2:30-3:00 P.M.----------- Coffee

3:00-4:30 P.M.----------- Group Discussions: Types of Libraries. Pleasant Hall Room Assignments:

Public	Room #130
Academic	Room $154
School or Media	Room # 50
Special	Room # 38
State	Room # 59

8:00-10:00 P.M.---------- Miss Genevieve Casey, presiding.

Reports from Types of Library Discussion Groups.

Progress report on Louisiana Library Association Resources Survey by Miss Sue Hefley.

"Taking Stock of the Institute," by Miss Genevieve Casey.

Thursday, October 30, 1969

8:30 A.M.---------------- Study Groups on Patterns of Library Development for Louisiana Library Systems. (See previous Room Assignments above)

1:00-2:00 P.M.----------- Study Groups, continued.

2:30 P.M.---------------- LSU Library Lecture, Colonnade Theater, LSU Union. "The University Library and Social Change," by Dr. James E. Skipper, University Librarian, University of California, Berkeley.

3:45 P.M.---------------- Coffee, LSU Library Lounge.

6:30 P.M.---------------- Dinner, LSU Union, Royal Ballroom. Mr. James Cookston, presiding.

7:30 P.M.---------------- Mrs. Florrinell F. Morton, presentation of the speaker. "A Louisiana Library System: Focus on the User," by Dr. Peter Hiatt, Associate Professor, Graduate Library School, Indiana University, and Public Library Consultant, Indiana State Library.

Friday, October 31, 1969 Pleasant Hall, Room 130
Miss Genevieve Casey, presiding.

8:30 A.M.---------------- Presentation of Reports of Study Groups.

12:00 Noon--------------- Culminating Luncheon, LSU Union, Royal Ballroom, Dr. Shirley K. Stephenson, presiding. Reactions to the Reports of the Study Committees, Miss Casey and Dr. Hiatt.

Conclusion of Conference

****

OBJECTIVES OF THE INSTITUTE

1. To explore in general the concept of systems of libraries and to study in depth its application in a number and variety of programs.

2. To consider how the systems concept can be embodied in future plans for library development in Louisiana and provide opportunities for the participants from states other than Louisiana to gain deeper insights and wider acquaintance with the systems concept and make appropriate applications to their respective states.

3. To identify and develop plans for improving library, media and information programs of Louisiana through library systems for interlibrary cooperation and to establish priorities and coordinate efforts through statewide planning.*

**These objectives, identified by the Institute Director, vary slightly from the objectives originally stated in the proposal to the United States Office of Education in the fall of 1968. The modification of the objectives was due in part to the progress made by the Sub-Committee on Planning of the Louisiana Library Association Library Development Committee of Louisiana and the progressive study and planning by the members of the library profession in various sections of the state.*

Some redefinition of objectives occurred during the Institute, since throughout the conference Miss Genevieve Casey and the various speakers and consultants brought a recurring focus of emphasis on identifying goals and setting appropriate priorities.

KEYNOTE ADDRESS

by

Charles Nelson*

I am happy to be here with you today and to be involved in your planning of a Louisiana library system. Since my arrival last night, I have been attempting to glean a bit more information that that already available to me.

Specifically, I have been inquiring into your current situation in regard to Louisiana in order to speak to you about matters relevant to your concerns. Should I not succeed in that respect, I would be happy to engage in more direct conversations with you in the way of comments and questions following my remarks.

First, I would like to make it clear that I cannot and will not provide any prescriptions for immediate success in your statewide plans. I have been a full-time consultant now for over 13 years, and that has given me a great deal of respect for intimate knowledge of particular situations. Because of this, I do not think there are any blanket solutions to problems in the library field any more than there are in the fields of higher education, elementary education or anywhere else where you are dealing with complexities.

The title of this Institute contains the phrase, "The Concept of Systems of Libraries with Special Application to Louisiana." This expresses well the two parts of the problem--the general discussion of the nature of systems plus the specific

---

**Mr. Nelson is Principal of Peat, Marwick, Mitchell and Company, New York City, and is author of PUBLIC LIBRARY SYSTEMS IN THE UNITED STATES (Chicago: American Library Association, 1969).*

This presentation was prepared by the editor from a transcript of the tape-recorded address. Every effort has been made to present the thoughts and ideas as expressed by the speaker.

relation of those systems to Louisiana.

Possibly I can provide some needed information on the nature of systems based on the work that my colleagues and I have done in studying systems of various kinds. However, in the area of special application to Louisiana, I intend to rely on your ideas. Louisiana is similar to other states in some respects, but I feel that it has some very special conditions and those conditions are more familiar to the residents of the area.

I intend to divide my remarks basically into five parts. First, I want to deal with public library systems, and I will rely heavily on our publication, Public Library Systems in the United States. Secondly, I want to speak about cooperation among different types of libraries including academic, school, special and state libraries as well as public libraries. I also want to comment on pilot and demonstration programs, as I have been informed you intend to launch into one or more of these.

In the fourth part, I would like to deal with state responsibilities briefly. Finally, I want to return to public libraries to discuss special professional responsibilities of public librarians in assuring that service is available to all types of users or potential users in any kind of statewide plan.

Those of you who have had an opportunity to review our national study on public library systems are aware of the fact that one of the biggest problems confronting us, and one which has certainly not been resolved, is trying to determine what a system is. A major conclusion of the national survey was that there needed to be a redefinition of public library systems to prepare for the time when the profession begins to reformulate its standards in order to relate the standards to the peculiar responsibilities of systems of different types.

Our study indicated that we must change our thinking about systems. To do this, we proposed to define a public library system as a complex of libraries in which the resources and services of this complex are made available either to the libraries belonging to the system or directly to the patrons in the system's service area. Then, we suggested a distinction within the system, or what we refer to as a primary system.

This primary system provides a variety of services either to the libraries within the system or directly to the patrons. These functions are intended to promote the general purpose of all round improved library service. The most common functions include free borrowing privileges, interlibrary loan and referral of reference questions among others.

The primary system is then divided into two classes--the multijurisdictional system and the single jurisdictional system. The multijurisdictional system provides services across boundaries of cities, towns, counties and states. By this definition, all Louisiana parish libraries are multijurisdictional systems as they cross city and town boundaries. The single jurisdictional system provides services within a single governmental unit, such as the large city library system.

Another class of systems is referred to as the special purpose system. This system is created for one or two particular purposes. Its most common form is that of an area reference service or a centralized processing facility. Typically, this type of system services other systems of libraries, but it may also provide limited patron service.

This is but a glimpse of the complexities of system development, but it is enough of a view to indicate that the standards in any library system must be developed along the lines of the functions these particular systems perform.

To further explain the type of thinking needed in considering systems development, let us examine the multijurisdictional or multiparish or county system which is now becoming so widespread. In this system, attention must be given to questions of organizational structure. Thus, standards then might begin to relate to structural questions.

One of the important findings of the survey in this relation is that it cannot be concluded on the basis of any available data that one form of organizational structure is superior to any other. Generally speaking, it appears that a highly centralized or consolidated system produces the best results in rural areas. On the other hand, in suburban regions in proximity to metropolitan areas, a federated or cooperative system appears superior.

There may be some implications here which you should not overlook in your desire to plan a statewide system. *Can the same organizational structure fit all systems when some are highly rural with others more concentrated urban and suburban complexes?*

Not only is the organizational structure affected by the type of population being served, but the library collection must also be considered. The standards for the type of collection for your multijurisdictional system would differ according to the area's population and needs.

For example, in rural areas, it is probably sufficient that community libraries have formal access to reference sources even though they might be distant. But, in more urban locations, not only should formal access be secure to outside collections of special value, but a priority should be attached to developing strong central resources within the system.

Thus, it is conceivable that in a statewide system, the standards you would want to impose upon your services in different parts of the state might be appropriately different.

As you approach your special requirements here in Louisiana, there is one rather obvious comment that I will hazard to make though it seems very obvious. That is that the real clue here is to find the heart of your problem, for it is only when you define the central problem that you can determine whether any plan you devise is solid. Granted, it takes money to solve most problems. However, the statement that money is the problem is not quite enough. Money solves all kinds of problems, but it does not solve everything.

What kinds of problems does money solve? Or, more properly, what are your problems? How do you propose to solve them? How much money will it take?

To put this matter to you another way, you are looking at a change in organization structure, and you know you cannot improve the quality of your service without additional funds. Ask yourselves the question: Will the change in the organization structure contribute to the solution of the financial problem? If it will, there is much to be said for the new structure. If not, why think about it?

In my years as a consultant, I have found that one of the major reasons people tend to think about structure and organization so much is that *they cannot see a solution to their own real problems.*

This may be the issue in your thinking about statewide systems. In consideration of this, I say to you, try to get a definite clue to the root of your problem so that everything you discuss concerning structure, systems and cooperation is clearly related to the solution of your basic problem.

This is a necessity because cooperation alone is not good in itself. It is extremely difficult, and it has very little to recommend in itself among institutions. In terms of institutional responsibility, cooperation should not be considered as a virtue but as part of a scheme to achieve something that needs to be done.

Another way of examining the question before you is to point to the fact that Louisiana already has a network of public library systems. But the problem you now face, as I understand it, is whether the present system should be overhauled or another system imposed on it in order to improve library service.

It appears that you are now considering a cooperative plan in which all types of libraries in the state would be involved. An alternative to that would be the development of the multicounty or parish public library system as a basis for building whatever additional structure you feel is necessary.

I do not see how you can determine which plan is the right one to follow without first defining the heart of your problem.

However, should you pursue this project, there are several good rules to follow in planning the structure of organizations.

The one I feel certain about and consider most basic is that *form follows function.* If you can first determine the functions you consider most important, the form will not be difficult to establish.

In your planning stage, I would like to caution you against the somewhat slavish tendency to borrow ideas from already established systems. Your state is unlike any other. Therefore, imposing a system upon it which has been successful elsewhere is not necessarily the answer. An original approach in attacking your problems is not only fun and desirable, but it may be absolutely necessary. After all, you will be serving the people of Louisiana, not the population of New York or Michigan or Ohio, and your residents may not gain all the benefits of a plan devised for use in another state.

What I need to say to you, in general, is that *the future of libraries lies in the systems approach.* But, the enthusiasm for systems must be translated into decisions on questions of policy, financing, organization and a multitude of other matters before anything meaningful can be developed.

The national survey made evident that the system structure is less important than the quality of staff and the level of support. This was particularly noticeable in the in depth studies conducted on six existing systems. These case studies led us to the following conclusions:

> There is some temptation to infer from observation of the six systems that not only does membership in a system result in a more even and predictable level of performance than in a comparable group of nonsystem libraries, but that this condition exists to a greater degree in those systems with a high degree of centralization than it does in a federation of locally supported and locally controlled libraries. Certainly the branches of the Fairfax County (Fairfax County Public Library System, Fairfax, Virginia) system show a high degree of consistency in the factors which contribute to good library service. The difficulty with such a conclusion is that an equally strong case can be made for a correlation between effectiveness and a number of other factors, such as level of support, the competence of the director, geography, certain social aspects of the community, etc. The problem is often further complicated by the question of which is cause and

> which is effect. Is support generous because of a good director, is there a good director because there is good support, are both of these factors the result of something else, or are they all interacting?
>
> The impression one gains from the six library systems visited is that the type of organization which a system employs is determined to a considerable extent by pre-existing conditions and that, while each kind of structure has certain advantages, the actual performance of the units of a particular system depends to a much greater extent on the ability of the staff, the level of support, and other conditions which may not relate very closely to system structure.[1]

I believe one of the things that the American Library Association and the Public Library Association had hoped we might discover when they sponsored the study was that there was a common organizational solution to all these problems. In all honesty, we cannot make such a claim.

However, since we do have a number of other evidences which came out of the survey, I believe some of them are worth serious consideration when you plan your structure. For instance, if quality of staff is a vital consideration in quality of service to the patron, then is the structure you are thinking about one which will produce a better quality staff? If it will not, then what other gain will it produce? If it will, then it may be a crucial consideration in your decision.

On the other hand, if the key to quality of staff in part lies with providing the funds to hire the qualified staff, is the solution that you are seeking the *one which will provide the funds to do that job?* If it is not, then perhaps you should examine the problem again.

The most important conclusion we reached in our study of systems, which could not be controverted, is that the greatest fundamental advantage of the systems concept is providing access to library service to previously unserved people. To the extent that you are confronted with this problem in Louisiana, it may be one which should be given serious study in the early planning stages of your program before you get into the more involved complexities of systems development.

Another finding relevant to your Institute is that there are certain services characteristic of most systems and while their being characteristic does not make them ideal, I feel citing them will give you a more accurate picture of systems and their services. We divided these characteristic services into two parts: services to patrons and services to libraries.

Among the characteristics falling under services to patrons, those most common were reciprocal borrowing privileges, interlibrary loan, a method of reference referral, and the maintenance of some type of locating tool to aid in finding the materials available in the system.

As far as services to libraries were concerned, the most widespread characteristic was that of augmentation of collections usually by rotating collections. Other services commonly offered were those of providing professional advice and instruction such as having a specialist on hand to weed collections, in-service training, consultants on particular types of services, and finally centralized processing including purchasing and cataloging. This last is the most common system service of all, and also the most widely criticized. Additionally, administrative planning and advice are available in assisting in developing the system into a workable one for the area.

In considering systems in relation to services, there seem to be three fundamental problems which must be considered. They relate to finance, organization and staffing. But, the improvement of services is dependent on a definite relationship between these three elements, and I would suggest that careful consideration be given to the interrelationships of these three elements. This is necessary, because if you think strictly about organization and delay thinking about finance until you have the organization worked out, you may have developed an organization which will not solve the financing problem.

Also, if you defer thinking about the upgrading and improvement of the quality of staffing essential to good library service, you may find you have created an organization which does not contribute to the improvement of staffing. It may not provide the opportunities for leadership and growth essential to attracting first class people to your staff.

On the other hand, sometimes a fundamental restructuring of your library program is essential in a state. I would like to point to the programs now underway in New Jersey and Pennsylvania. In both states, reference and/or district information centers have been imposed on already existing county or municipal library systems. This layering of systems is an extension of older library patterns and may be expected to increase.

It should be pointed out that the layering of systems is a result of plans to increase the number and quality of services already offered rather than simply to provide books to people who have been without them. It is important that this point be understood; that the layering has not come about as a means of providing access to library materials. It is only useful to provide assistance in meeting more sophisticated demands for library services.

I would now like to give you a concrete illustration of how finance and organization are interrelated to give some strength to the argument I made earlier that the organizational thinking you have to do must not be divorced from the question of where your plan will be financed. In our recent study of the two-year colleges in New York State, we dealt with both questions of organization and financing.

Due to the serious need for funds by these schools, the frequent lack of concern for them by the counties in which they were located, and the restrictive laws limiting student tuition, the only possible proposal was to ask the state to provide the additional needed funds.

I believe you are facing the same question here in a somewhat different context. How do you arrive at a means to make it attractive for the parishes to give up control over their libraries, and, at the same time, provide the necessary inducement for the state to pick up the tab?

In New York, the counties agreed to sacrifice their control of the two-year colleges when it was agreed to level off the amount of county financial support to the schools and turn to the state for additional funds. I might add that this proposal is now under study at the state level and has not yet been accepted. However, the counties did agree to release their control when given the proper inducement. I believe this serves to illustrate what I have been saying about the interrelationships between organizational structure and financing.

Now, before I move into another area, I would like to say a few more words about the competent staff other than what I have already discussed. Whenever I speak to librarians, I always take the opportunity to say that I continue to be amazed at the extent to which librarians underestimate the importance of good salaries. It is as true in the library profession as in the teaching profession that as the salaries rise so does the quality of the people entering that profession, and the threat of a shortage of professionally qualified persons is eliminated.

Money does make a difference, and it seems to me that the library profession should be paying more attention to it. It is very clear that the quality of staff is a really crucial factor in the quality of service. It will take more money to achieve that improved staff, and I want to encourage you to do more about the level of salaries in your profession.

Next, I would like to discuss cooperation among various types of libraries. What do we really know about this expanded picture of interlibrary cooperation? First, we know that academic, school and special libraries have in common the fact that they exist as part of an organization which has its own purposes to which the libraries must attune themselves.

These libraries cannot commit themselves to cooperation without giving consideration to the institution of which they are a part and their obligations to serve those institutions first. These three types of libraries and librarians have a responsibility to a central constituency in each case whether it be student, faculty, children or research staff.

Other libraries must face this and recognize the obligations these libraries have first of all to their institutions, because the attitudes of these libraries and librarians should not be interpreted by public libraries as intransigent or selfish. As a result of this, these libraries, and I am speaking primarily of the academic libraries, can cooperate only to the extent that it serves the common good and in some way assists their own institutions in carrying out their responsibilities to their particular public.

If we do not take these considerations seriously into our plan, they will fail because public officials responsible for these institutions will not be able to accept your proposals. We must understand that in this period of limited funds available to college and university libraries, we have to work out a plan in the context of whether the academic library can serve anyone beyond its immediate constituency without sacrificing something from already limited resources.

This underlines the point that if you are basically underfinanced, solutions that do not provide for financing probably will not work.

In relation to pilots and demonstrations, I understand you are now planning a pilot project. We do not know a lot about this but quite a substantial amount of library development, particularly in Louisiana, has come about via the demonstration approach. However, care must be taken in moving from public library service by demonstration to a pilot project involving the complexities of the interrelationships of various types of libraries plus the expansion of more complex systems services. To illustrate, consider an agreement on acquisitions policies in a pilot system in which certain libraries purchase certain materials while other libraries buy in other areas. This type of agreement can only be made by institutions responsibly if there is a long-term commitment. If you get a gap on your shelves for a couple of years in an important series because you cooperated with someone else who is to provide it, and then two years later the contractual arrangements fall down, you have a situation which may not be easy to correct.

In other words, certain types of cooperation require long-term commitments. For this reason, I would suggest that in trying to work out a pilot or demonstration, you should confine yourselves to types of activities in which losses would not be irrevocable should the demonstration fail.

Possibly, what we need to do is think about library development in stages as an alternative to what we have discussed. By this, I mean moving from lesser cooperative ventures to stronger and stronger relationships among institutions to the point where you have enough trust and interrelationship build-up that you can afford to move into cooperative ventures which necessitate long-term commitments.

Finally, I would like to deal with the responsibilities of the state in relation to libraries as determined by our national survey. In this area, I would like to end my remarks by summarizing for you the recommendations and suggestions we directed to the attention of state officials, state librarians, state library staff and leaders of the state library associations. They are:

1. Every state should establish a body of law that is congenial to the development of good public library service, including substantial ongoing state aid for library systems. . . . As of 1967, 19 states have no state aid programs; of the remainder, 11 states account for all except a fraction of the total $34,700,000. The federal government, on the other hand, allocated $78,000,000 in 1967, more than twice the total of all states combined. It is not necessary to arrive at any particualr "fair-share" formula to know that the existing shares are ill-balanced in most states. . . .
2. The state aid program should include strong incentives for local support of public library service. . . .
3. Interstate compacts and planning should be undertaken more widely to coordinate regional resources and to make arrangements easier for service across state borders . . . it will be necessary to remove restrictions prohibiting the expenditure of state funds in an adjoining state; otherwise economical contractual arrangements will be effectively barred.
4. Although public library systems have an important role in pursuing equitable arrangements for meeting reference and research library needs, it is primarily a state responsibility

> to plan, initiate, and help to support strong programs at this level. . . .
>
> 5. Public library systems, as well as nonsystem public libraries, have in general failed to react to the significance of the fact that at least half their users are students. Library systems share with the state library agency a clear responsibility for leadership in adjusting present service programs to the facts of student use. . . .
>
> 6. Plans for public library system development, especially at the state level, should recognize that the advanced reference and research information needs of users will require the use of resources of academic and special libraries and nonlibrary information networks. . . .
>
> 7. There have not been enough funds generally available for library construction since the Carnegie period . . . state funds, in addition to federal funds, should be made available for building construction. . . .
>
> 8. Every system must have access to, if it does not contain, strong reference resources. When the strength does not exist within the system, consideration should be given in every state to the creation of regional backstop library centers which can serve several systems.
>
> 9. . . . In at least 20 states very high priority should be given to the development of a statewide plan for library service as a necessary condition for rapid and intelligent system development.[2]

Thank you for giving me the opportunity to discuss library systems with you today as you begin your planning for your most current Louisiana library program.

Notes

[1] Nelson Associates, Public Library Systems in the United States (Chicago: American Library Association, 1969), pp. 213-214.

[2] Ibid., pp. 253-256.

THE BLACK GOLD COOPERATIVE LIBRARY SYSTEM

by

Catherine S. Chadwick*

It is an honor and a privilege to participate with you here in your study of the constitution and the objectives and the promise of library systems for Louisiana. I have always felt that Louisiana and California have much in common in their library development in that both very early became examples for other states. Your parish libraries were developed before many other regional type libraries of any kind were developed in your area of the country, and California developed the pioneer California county system in the early years of the twentieth century. Also, we share honors with you in the pioneer work of Miss Essae M. Culver, who was one of our county librarians.

For years the county pattern seemed to satisfy everyone who had anything to do with library development in the state of California. The cooperation between schools and public libraries was excellent. In my own county, for instance, the county librarian and the school director together rode on horseback in the back country to work with the little one-room schools. While as in so many other situations this was eminently satisfactory, it later came back to haunt us in the fact that public library service for children was extremely slow in developing in county libraries in California. For many golden years we rocked along, happy and satisfied with ourselves, while collections deteriorated, libraries moldered in basement rooms of court houses and little was done to reach the new type of California citizens who were coming in from all over, as well as being actually born in our fortunate state.

**Mrs. Chadwick is Administrative Librarian of the Black Gold Cooperative Library System and Librarian at the Ventura County and City Library, Ventura, California.*

Many excellent county systems developed in California, as they did in Louisiana. But, it was not until after the war years, really, that the impetus for development became strong enough that we began to think in terms of other than local situations, bounded by county lines.

A typical county library in California had a headquarters library in the county seat. Very possibly this headquarters library was weak and inadequate and still tied closely to the county school situation--its chief function often being the provision of additional materials for the schools. Perhaps in the very same town, maybe even across the street, a city library was also furnishing service to the people of the city, and serving only within the limited area circumscribed by the city limits.

The county library would perhaps once a month, or occasionally once every two weeks, take a box of books out to the smaller communities in the county. These books would in many cases be books that had been worn out by the headquarters library or were requests that had been asked for perhaps as long as three or four weeks before. Often the "library lady" from the smaller community had to come in to get the books.

Certainly currency or urgency were not part of the picture except in very rare cases. If you borrowed a book from one station you returned it to that station. We are all, as I am sure you know, the offspring of that very beneficent and lady-bountiful organization, the women's clubs of America, of one kind or another, who pioneered the concept of libraries in any form. Through their tremendous efforts they first established in their club houses small collections of books that somebody did not want and was therefore willing to give. Through money-raising activities, they purchased books that were in demand and saw to it that they were kept gathered and circulated in the community, first through subscription and eventually free.

The county libraries in our state are varied and in those where there was strong support through enlightened policy and officials, an outstanding program developed with strong children's librarians and adult services that met the needs of the area. In others, there was merely a nod in the direction of library service, and less than effectiveness in the development and handling of a program.

After World War II, however, our citizens began to feel the need of a higher level of service and efforts were made by library associations and by well educated citizens who realized that education was going to tell the story and library service would need to be far broader in scope to support the academic trend. Thought was then given to broadening service, to increasing support and to attempting to develop something worthwhile in the way of service.

In the 1950's, the first great landmark, The Public Library Inquiry, by Dr. Robert Leigh, set up the concept that library service supported by and designed for a small community was not enough for any community. It purported that a larger area of service was required to provide the fiscal backing and the strength of political support for the required scope and breadth of library service.

Against this background, a study was made of California library service in 1957. As a result of this study, six years later, in 1963, the state first enjoyed the ability to give financial support to public libraries.

Previous to that, of course, in 1956 we had the federal Library Services Act which enabled libraries in communities of 10,000 or less to add additional support and strength and to provide services hitherto unknown. In 1963, we had large, well supported city libraries, county libraries that were far from adequate in most cases, and a little informal coordination.

Formerly we believed that the only way to supply the necessary administrative control to library service was through the method of consolidation of libraries and consolidation had been urged upon libraries all over the state in California as well as in many other states for years. However, as all of us know very well, *to persuade a library to give up its own autonomy and turn it over to another jurisdiction is asking more of human nature* *than human nature can well support.* There have been some consolidations in California, and I'm sure elsewhere, where death or departure of the librarian and circumstances have allowed the situation to develop favorably, but for the most part we have had militantly autonomous libraries, both city and county, with a severe lack of technology and methodology for cooperation.

The Public Library Development Act implemented in 1963 allowed us the vehicle for cooperation without loss of autonomy in the form of systems of libraries. The basic concept is cooperation for specific purposes. The complete maintenance of autonomy in book selection, in personnel, in the matters that are dearest to the hearts of the community and the library board and the librarian is retained, but cooperation in strongly directed and structured activities is implicit. To bring about this type of cooperation is not an easy task. It involves basic feelings of inferiority and superiority, it means that for the good of the whole restraint must be practiced by all concerned in evaluation of the members' patterns.

As for the members of the Black Gold Cooperative Library System, they are:

> The Blanchard Community Library of Santa Paula--a small community of approximately 17,000 people with a slow growth rate; the library a memorial of over 60 years' standing in a community which is highly library oriented with a budget of $50,000 to $60,000 a year.
>
> San Luis Obispo Public Library--approximately the same size as Santa Paula but in a larger community which, however, it shares with the San Luis Obispo County Library, an extension library with a small outlet in San Luis Obispo and several larger branches in the county.
>
> Santa Maria Public--a library in a community of about 61,000 including two or three small branches.
>
> Lompoc--a population of 33,000 also including two or three small branches.
>
> Santa Barbara--the city of Santa Barbara and a branch system covering 112,000 people.
>
> Ventura--a population of 255,000 including all the cities in Ventura County, except Oxnard and Santa Paula.

Oxnard, the largest city in Ventura county, is not included in the Black Gold System nor is Paso Robles in San Luis Obispo County. All other municipalities in the three counties are included in the system.

The Black Gold System was born of the strong desire of a group of library directors of city and county jurisdictions to develop a means and methodology of cooperation to utilize each other's collections, to become stronger through utilizing more business-like methods to get the physical work of the library done, to emphasize the information aspects of library service through our information center, and by eliminating the need for duplicating work in each of the libraries that could more effectively be done in one setting.

Our first meeting was very dramatic. It came about when state funds became available under the Public Library Services Act after most of us had attended a California State Library workshop where there was a two-day discussion of book form catalogs, the possibility of a book form union catalog for the state, communication by teletype, and the idea of delivery service.

Many studies have shown that *success of interlibrary loan depends almost entirely upon immediate rapid access and answer*. Otherwise it is so often an exercise in futility with the book sitting on the shelf months, perhaps, after the individual has asked for it. No one is satisfied and no one can be said to enjoy good library service where delays of this sort are carried on through lack of access.

As the most recent article about the Black Gold System describes, we were born in a little community bordering all of our counties. This is a small oil community, and since we were already identified so strongly with the oil business of California we called ourselves Black Gold.

Our ideas gathered from the workshop on book catalogs led us to plan a processing center to process all of our books, a union book form catalog listing the books we were purchasing, and perhaps later on all the books available in the system, with location symbols indicating where the books were held. We agreed to ask each other for the use of these books which would be delivered by a van so that mailing was not necessary. We planned to eventually have a teletype system to get more rapid communications, to set up a film circuit, and to establish an information center as soon as possible.

All these dreams have been realized now with the exception of producing a book catalog listing all of the materials we have available. As well as being our primary objective, our dearest dream and our most expensive and difficult problem, the book form catalog, though the reason for which we really became organized, has been the constant source of interest, concern, in some cases satisfaction, and in others despair.

The requirements for the system as set up in Sacramento involve certain rather arbitrary practices as set down by the state library and further implemented by a study later to be done by Lowell Martin and Roberta Bowler, called Library Service Equal to the Challenge of California. Also, the California Library Association Master Plan which was then in progress and later has been approved, established the idea of community libraries which would be related to an area library and this in turn would be related to a research or reference center and eventually to the state library.

Our first experiences simply called upon us to ask each other for help, and if help were not available in the system then we would go outside to the state library. As a matter of actual practice some of our libraries found it very difficult to ask another library in a lateral position for help. I don't want this talk to deteriorate into a discussion of human nature, although I must say that *human nature is by far and away the most active ingredient in system management and system success.* It took years, and we're still working on it to persuade the clerical and the branch library assistants that if a book were wanted by a patron, our first resource was ourselves, but if the local area did not have it then we would go beyond and ask until we did succeed in getting it.

Studies have been done as you will note from the one by

Dr. Sarah Vann on the participation satisfaction by the members of the system. These studies for the most part were made by the head librarians and without exception our head librarians have been enthusiastic and cooperative. There has been a bond among us that is, I think, very unusual in system operation, but we have had serious problems in many cases with other staff members.

The most serious seems to be with the branch library assistants who in the past were doing professional type jobs, although they are not professionally trained. For instance, we now know through studies and at least are informed by experts that branch library assistants can catalog fiction and less difficult nonfiction, particularly since the use of LC information has become so widespread. This practice was followed in many of the libraries. In fact, our libraries in some cases were so small that the only professional in the library was the head librarian and all other work was done by people not professionally trained. When the books were sent to the processing center instead of being done at home it was very hard for many of these people to accept the fact that they were not doing what they considered library work, that they had been replaced by qualified professional librarians.

Quite frequently, we would find our efforts sabotaged by loyal local library employees who simply could not accept the fact that it was no disgrace not to have the book, that the important thing was to make the book available. We find this to be true even today especially in our branches, although our very effective information service coordinator has accomplished miracles in meeting with our extension people to bring about a better understanding and attitude toward service.

Setting up the routines for the operation was tremendously difficult, time-consuming, and in many cases we still have not solved all problems. Among our premises were the idea of each library selecting its own book and also that each library should develop a special aspect of the total collection in harmony with the backlog of materials already held by that library.

We still have some blank spaces in our total collection, and are working on this idea all the time. Rather than provide a list, which is a practice followed by systems where the system information coordinator or the administrator sends out a list of all likely books from which the system members can choose, we set up a pattern of selection utilizing a number of selection tools. Among these were Kirkus because we wanted to get the books selected before publication, Choice, Library Journal, Technical Books and several others that come out at different times of the month. In order to insure the idea that all titles would be ordered as nearly as possible on a certain date by all libraries and would therefore arrive together and be processed together, a close schedule was set up which has had to be altered a number of times but which often works well.

When the books are received, a processing program is put into effect which provides that a stencil is made on a small stencil machine giving the author, title, and date of the book. This stencil is used in making a pocket for the book and a simple shelf list card.

Before the book can be processed, however, it goes to the cataloging center. The cataloging is done there by a professional cataloger and the necessary information is noted on one of the multiple copies of the original order system which is passed on to the processing center. The pocket is pasted in, the book jacket is added, and a Se-Lin label is made all without regard to ownership of the book which was stamped on receipt and checked against a copy of the invoice on its receipt. The books are handled without regard to ownership from that point on until they are finally, after the jacket, pocket and label have been placed, distributed to canvas bags labeled with the name of the jurisdiction to which they are going.

Twice a week the deliveries are made on a 230-mile run which takes the van to each library on the way up and to each library on the way back to be sure that everybody gets all possible service on the run. In this run also are included films from our film circuit, special requests and often administrative messages of one kind or another which carry on the business of the system.

If there has been a special request, it will probably have come through by teletype. We have closed circuit and TWX in Ventura and Santa Barbara, but only closed circuit in each of the other system libraries. The reason for the two is that Ventura's County and City System is quite large in comparison to the other libraries involved, and it would not be possible to put through all the questions that are required to the California State Library and other libraries outside of our closed circuit system if they all had to go through Santa Barbara. The closed circuit system involves the seven libraries and Moorpark College.

During the past year a new dimension was added to our processing program in that we learned to prepare the paper tapes which were to be converted into magnetic tapes and then by computer setting to become the composed page of our book catalogs. The machines used in this procedure are complex and temperamental and a great deal of trauma was added to the learning process in finally mastering the preparation of material. However, we have been able to do this and it has greatly decreased the cost of the operation.

Efforts have been made to share public relations activities, such as book reviews which are prepared in Ventura and utilized for newspapers in Ventura county and are shared with the newspapers of communities in which the Black Gold libraries operate. Public relations has been one of our most difficult problems as we have been working so hard to keep up our system and to take advantage of every possibility for better communication and better programs that we have not faithfully recorded and shared with others the developments of our system. We early developed a union reference file and put together all the materials that were held as reference materials and shared with each on this program. A union list of serials, first on cards and this last year by computer processing, has enabled us to share in this vital aspect of library service. In order to make the union list of serials a more effective tool microfilm reader printers have been purchased with the system funds for each of the libraries in the system.

One of the prospects we are now facing is the possibility of combining book form catalog data with other libraries and library systems and, thus, avoiding the labor which would be involved in key punching all of our materials to produce a file of all library materials available to the system. If, for instance, such a plan could be developed and rules of the game established so that each library were providing the data in the same format or MARC tape data could be utilized, through the magic of the computer we could produce a mass of data which translated and selected by the computer would enable any library system to seek and retrieve their own collection with ease and comparative lack of cost.

Cost, of course, is one of our biggest problems. The cost of producing a book form catalog for an individual library is practically prohibitive. Though costs have gone down and we consider that since our catalog serves our seven libraries the unit cost per library is not high; still such a formidable amount of our budget is taken up in this form that we are constantly threatened in our ongoing program and have not yet been able to pull the whole thing together as we would desire to do. We think of the book form catalog like CBI or the Reader's Guide, but it would be of immeasurable value to be able to program complete reproduction with cumulations for every third year at least. As it is, we have annuals for the past five years, and we are constantly seeking methods by which we can put the thing together into one alphabet--as author, subject, title, and so forth.

Another possibility is that the California State Library, which has been embarked upon developing an automation program for the past three years, will be able to perform the function of producing a book form catalog for any of the library systems in the state, or any individual library if this were desired. The target date for implementation of such a program is 1972, and in the meantime the Institute of Library Research has been working with the state library to develop the concept as fully as possible. We do not know at this point whether or not or when these objectives may be realized.

Concerning funding, the local funds supporting the system began at $70,000 and are up this year (1969) to $100,000. These funds are divided by a formula based upon the use of the system made by the various libraries, which in turn is based upon the book budget, the number of titles requiring processing, the amount of interlibrary loan, and so forth.

The last phase of the plan of service developed by the Black Gold Cooperative Library System to be implemented and that which has turned out to be perhaps the most important in its effect upon library service was the information center. The information center was a problem from the beginning for several reasons. One, there was some disagreement as to where it should be established, since the fiscal and administrative center was in Ventura. Santa Barbara has a larger collection of reference materials but it was having severe internal problems at the time of the establishment of the library system. The most serious problem of all, to find the right kind of person to develop the information system, was a long drawn out task. Finally, the information system became a reality two years ago, funded by state-federal funds and set up in Santa Barbara under the capable administration of Mrs. Nadine Greenup, who has made information service a reality in our area.

Another alternative which comes up every year when we wonder whether we are going to be able to carry on our program is the possibility of producing our own catalogs. Our confidence in our ability to do this has increased since we do prepare tapes now, and since there is access to various types of service bureaus which could produce the catalog. If we have to do this we will, but it would involve the employment of a person of ability in library and systems work and we would prefer to continue to utilize the services of a responsible and reliable company rather than embarking on all the problems that such a program would involve.

Once in a while someone says, "What if we didn't have the book catalog?" It is expensive and it is fraught with problems of all kinds, but when we think of the communication that it gives us, the unity that it gives us, the support that it gives our program, we know that just as we established the Black Gold System in great measure based upon the concept of the book form catalog, we would not at this point be willing to give it up. It would seem to be one of the last possible alternatives.

LIBRARY SYSTEMS SERVICES TO YOUTH

by

Isobel P. Lynch*

During this week together, we propose to explore the systems concept and to study in depth its application in a number and variety of specific instances. Under the word system in Webster's unabridged dictionary there are thirteen definitions. Two of them seem especially pertinent in the context of the Institute objectives.

One definition is "a complex unity formed of many often diverse parts subject to a common plan or serving a common purpose . . . an aggregation or assemblage of objects in regular interaction or interdependence."

The second definition is "an organization or network for the collection and distribution of information, news, or entertainment."

There is a third definition of system we might keep in mind. It is perhaps peculiarly appropriate in any discussion of services to youth. But this, I shall save for later.

In the first definition, a system is referred to as a complex unity. A key word, it seems to me, is *complex*. Our idea of a library system, I believe, has been one of a relatively simple unity wherein the parts are libraries. The diversity lies not in the parts, but in the type of parts--that is, public libraries, school libraries, etc.

There are at least two other ways of looking at libraries and library services systematically. A single library in a broad sense is in itself a unity of such diverse elements as readers or users, resources and librarians. Secondly, a library, as a community institution, is one of the diverse parts of a system of community services.

**Miss Lynch is Education Supervisor for the Division of Library extension, Maryland Department of Education, Baltimore, Maryland.*

The real challenge and promise of the system concept, it seems to me, lie in our *willingness* to accept the complexity of library relationships, understand their interlocking implications, and thereby develop more comprehensive and imaginative plans and roles for libraries. It is not enough simply to blueprint a hierarchical structure for existing structures.

I will be the first to admit that this proposed process of looking at library services as components of more than one system all at the same time is complex and difficult. What the process should do is to enable us to look at services and potentials for service from several angles. This, then, is what I should like to do:

1. Identify the common plan or purpose that ties libraries with other components in three kinds of systems--a system of libraries, a library that is a system in itself, and a system of community services that includes library service.
2. Explore these systems as they might affect a single library's service to young people.
3. Point out some paths that might be followed and raise some questions that might be worth your consideration as you plan for library development in Louisiana.

At the outset I should add that since we are concerned with library services to *youth*, most of my observations are centered on school and public libraries. Youth and the services they have where they live also frame my thoughts, so you will see that the discussion rests primarily on the basic or community level of library service.

First, then, let us examine the usual system of libraries. Here we have, as defined by the Humphrys in the Louisiana study, ". . . a group of libraries within a defined geographical area working together for the improvement of library service for all residents of the area."[1]

The common purpose--improvement of library service--we might agree can be stated a bit more specifically as one of reinforcing services at the community level. The wealth of large libraries--wealth in terms of collections and professional skills--is shared with small libraries. The democratic nature of this library system is also expressed in its common plan of cooperative activities. The interests of individual libraries are safeguarded and each library has equal right to enjoy the benefits of system services.

---

[1] John A. Humphry and James Humphry III, Library Services in Louisiana (New York, 1968).

How does this system of libraries improve services for youth who use a school or public library in a small community? There are all the indirect and supportive services that are channeled through larger service units. These, of course, are familiar to us. Among them are the common system services of providing a system processing center and a centralized public relations resource. The processing center is responsible for obtaining the material and preparing it for use by the young, while the public relations center concentrates on encouraging the young to use the materials.

These are but a sampling of system services. I think they and other services we might review can lead us to question whether we are really sharing as much as possible. *Do we really have a system at the community level?*

Some Louisiana school systems, I understand, have centers for pre-purchase examination and evaluation of materials. In these centers, school librarians and teachers work together with the center's collection. This assures that what is added to a school library, or what is incorporated into a course of study, can be selected on the basis of shared knowledge and experience. The matching of teaching objectives with library materials that these centers promote must surely benefit youth. But, is there a role for a public library and its children's librarian in this kind of school library system service?

Pennsylvania has three regional centers for the evaluation of school library materials. In at least one of these, public librarians do participate. The pooling of specialized skills, experience and resources is extended in another direction, too, in the Pennsylvania centers. One center is responsible for identifying and evaluating materials for the slow and hesitant learner. Another screens resources on Negro and African culture. The third concentrates upon Pennsylvania history.

A variation on this theme was tried this past summer in Maryland. For the first time, Maryland this year is enjoying public, non-commercial, television broadcasts. The daytime hours are largely taken up for instructional television. The broadcasts are available to those classroom teachers who have access to receivers. They take up twenty or thirty minutes of a class hour. The TV lessons are just another tool or resource, like a book or a filmstrip, to supplement the teacher's work with students.

How will teachers use this new tool? They have manuals that suggest classroom activity before and after each TV lesson. But they need something more, it was thought in Maryland, and this is where the librarians entered the picture. Maryland's school and public librarians teamed up this past summer and prepared bibliographies of books and audio-visual materials that would round out the TV-assisted lesson.

Since Maryland's instructional television is publicly broadcast and as easily received in the home or private school as in the public school, the public librarians were eager to have their library materials represented. They realized that interests stirred up by the classroom TV could be reinforced by their resources, too. They welcomed an opportunity to include public library materials in the bibliographies.

Aside from story-telling services that a library system might provide for children, what other direct services do systems offer? Some systems operate bookmobiles which provide convenient lending services for all ages. Incidentally, do bookmobiles serve youth chiefly at school locations? If so, is this too limited in terms of numbers served or function? Do bookmobile schedules include afternoon, evening, and weekend hours at places, other than schools, where young people may be found?

The most familiar of the direct services that a library system offers to a user is access to the specialized materials that are not available in the user's local library. The interlibrary loan service is a great thing, and when the process is speeded up by TWX or WATS lines and daily truck deliveries, it is even more impressive.

Another great attribute of interlibrary loans is that public, academic and research libraries are generally active participants. They are joined, not because they are the same type of libraries, but because they have a common interest in providing a reader with the material he needs no matter who owns it.

Does the interlibrary loan service work effectively for school libraries and their users? Mostly I find school libraries are not part of a statewide network of interlibrary loan service, either as lenders or borrowers. Perhaps some borrowing is done for school faculty. Can a public library borrow films from its neighboring school library system? Do students get a fair deal on interlibrary loans? Is the privilege denied? Or, at best, will a student's request be routed only a limited distance along the system's network? Are the needs for special resources expressed by those over eighteen the only ones we consider serious enough to be worth exhaustive effort? *What restrictions are really necessary?*

We have seen that a system consists of libraries linked to one another as an "assemblage of objects joined in regular interaction." The libraries are subject to common plans or agreed-upon interaction. It can be assumed the common purpose, improvement of service, will be achieved through this interaction.

However, suppose we look more closely at our common purpose. What are the implications of Webster's second definition: ". . .an organization for the collection and distribution of information, news or entertainment"? It seems to me that for the most part the library system services we have been discussing relate to the collecting function. Do we consider our libraries to be collecting devices to such an extent that we overlook their role as distributors?

We have designed plans that specify what types of books and other recorded information will be in what kinds of libraries so that a library user may know what service to expect or to what lengths he or his librarian may go to satisfy his needs. But is this really distributing information? Are we as librarians in our systems of libraries saying, "Here it is. Come and get it"?

The function of distribution seems to depend upon the willingness of individuals to play the library game--upon the convenience of services. The dissemination of the content of a library's collection might be improved if an attempt were made to identify the information needed and the services that are required to get that information to a point of use, that is, a library user.

School system evaluation centers are undoubtedly a device for identifying these needs and locating the matching resources. School librarians work within the fairly well defined areas of an educational program. It is perhaps easier for them to anticipate demand and put learning resources in the hands of teachers and students. To transfer this kind of anticipatory service to a public library environment may be difficult, but it is worth the effort.

One approach has been suggested by Emerson Greenaway, former director of the Philadelphia Free Library. He has proposed the creation of a "Library Authority" to be responsible for library services for students. This is akin to an idea developed several years ago by a group that drafted a plan of total library service for Columbia, a new town in Maryland that at the time was only on the drawing boards. The Columbia plan called for a Communication Authority which would transfer needed information to school and public libraries, and to other agencies such as business firms or individual homes as well.

Philadelphia is worthy of note, too, for a study that is currently under way there. This study, still in the design stage, is supported by U.S. Office of Education research funds. It has two objectives: one, to determine library resource requirements of elementary and secondary school students, and two, to outline the responsibilities for school libraries and public libraries to meet these requirements.

The library authority or research routes may lead to equal partnership of school and public libraries in a library system, but it would be regrettable if student needs were the only concern. Young people today have interests that range beyond those generated in class assignments. How are library systems going to respond to these?

The 1968 ALA Conference interdivisional program lengthily entitled, "Librarians Who Work with Young People Face the Future Together," yielded some observations that may guide us. One suggestion was that library jobs be found for those youth who need to earn money to stay in school. Other ideas included library programs centered on problems that concern today's youth, and the involvement of young people in determining what kinds of library services will meet their needs.

These, then, are some of the common plans and common purposes that might be considered when we attempt to plan a library system. *Can we create new channels between school and public libraries? If they are created, what services for youth will they carry?*

Let us now turn to the single library that is a system in itself.

The system parts here are the reader, the library resources and the librarians. The common purpose of this network is to put knowledge to work. What are the arrangements that will enable user, resource, and librarian to interact? The common plan, calling for cooperative arrangements to share in resources and services, raises the question--*who are the cooperators?*

In this situation, let us suppose reader and librarian join forces to exploit the resources and services that constitute a library. How should the system be planned from this point of view?

We, as librarians, make arrangements to collect resources and provide services for their use. In a sense, library users are partners in this activity, for, of course, librarians acquire materials they believe their users want or need and they are responsive to an expressed and an unexpressed demand. Library users cooperate with librarians and share in the service arrangements in so far as they, the users, are willing to accept the services. But are the library users as partners in this system's cooperative arrangements too silent? Should we as librarians make sure that the reader's conception of service and ours are in agreement?

Of course, many of us who have worked with young people may be inclined to believe that user expectations fall in the category of opportunities to meet and greet one's friends. But more seriously, I think we should attempt to discover what role the teenager expects his librarian to play.

An interesting attack on the problem of obtaining greater specificity in regard to user, when we describe library services, has been undertaken in Indiana. Dr. James Liesener and Dr. Edwin Olson have just completed a survey of user services in Indiana libraries. The survey questionnaire was completed by librarians, but it could easily be adapted and filled out by readers. It provides a means to look at services from the user's point of view and identify what is offered in terms of assistance in locating materials, study space and the like. An inventory of services such as this should throw new light on library functions and would possibly reveal strings we may have tied to the use of our resources. *Can system services be so designed that frustrating red tape is eliminated or minimized?*

As we re-examine the interdependencies and relationships of users, library materials and librarians within a single library, we should look for ways to strengthen the partnerships between users and librarians. In this way, working together, we can discover new ways to improve a single library's system of services. These discoveries, in turn, should have implications for libraries organized into systems.

What are the implications if we look at libraries as members of a system of community services?

In a community network, libraries join non-library agencies in assessing needs and goals of the residents. Each agency attempts to assemble resources and professional services that will be responsive to perceived needs. Since each community service agency works for the public good or interests, it can be said that each of the diverse parts serves a common purpose. But are there not some subordinate purposes that reveal opportunities for libraries to establish some cooperative arrangements with other agencies to share resources and services?

If these objectives of neighboring agencies were taken into consideration, we might have a different perspective on library services. Our library system planning might benefit from what one could term outside input. For example, how do recreation agencies work with youth? What are the teenage needs these agencies have identified and how are they met?

Other community agencies also have problems of scarce means and limited resources. So do libraries. What is the priority ranking of needs, for example, that a recreation agency may establish so that its limited resources are wisely allocated? Does this ranking have any bearing on a library's priorities and can better solutions be found through joint effort?

The exploration of the avenues that connect libraries with other institutions serving society, I believe, can add a new dimension to the term library system and enhance the services the system will provide.

We have now looked at libraries in three cooperative roles--libraries cooperating with other libraries; libraries sharing with their users responsibility for service, and libraries as partners with non-library organizations. What has this exercise told us about library systems services for youth? Not too much that is startlingly new, I'm afraid. You will remember I did say initially that I am not too sure what library systems services should be.

When a library's relation to other libraries in a system of libraries was reviewed, some specific services for youth were mentioned. The professional literature will yield ample description of these and other services that have proven successful. Obviously, it will be necessary to investigate these performances and judge whether they hold promise for Louisiana, particularly Louisiana's youth.

The three systems I have discussed involved libraries as a common element. They had another common element--*the user*. I hope the position of the user in each system was as prominent to you as I intended.

If we first consider a single library, we should see if we have exploited the systems concept to the fullest. It is at this point that the user should be assured that the library's on-site resources and services are designed to give him the maximum satisfaction possible. This library may have severe limitations in resources and staff, but it is the library for its users. What services can it perform without relying on outside help? What resources and services must be brought in from the outside?

Once the single library's interactions with its clientele are designed so that its resources and services are used to the maximum, it is time to take stock of the needed and missing services and resources and determine ways to supply them.

Of course, a local library which has expanded or redefined its role through establishing its place in a system of community services and making use of their services and resources will still require outside library resources and services to meet its users' needs. It is at this point that one looks again at a system of libraries or library systems. What are the channels for this reinforcement and *are they as extensive as possible?*

In discussing the interaction of libraries, community agencies and systems, I think we should ask ourselves whether we have explored all the connecting channels possible. Are our existing connections strong enough is another question to raise. At the community level, for example, what would happen if the school and public libraries were linked? Could interlibrary loan procedures be established which would be of direct benefit to youth? What might happen if a school system's center could be paired with a college library, especially if the college is a teacher training institution? Can we reinforce the partnership between library user and librarian to make our services more effective?

In all three of our partnership arrangements, we should keep in mind that the common purpose is *improved service for youth.* This is the bond that links the partners. In addition to the commitment to service for youth, the partners in library systems must make an effective commitment to cooperation.

COOPERATION, LIKE CHARITY, SHOULD BEGIN AT HOME. This is why I believe that planning for library system services must start at the local level where the service beneficiaries, the users, are. A solid foundation for a library system rests with the kinds of library services that can be offered Louisiana young people in their home communities and the decisions about how responsibility for these services can be shared.

Obviously, at the local level, library services will be fragmented, ineffective, and possibly marked by redundancy if there is not cooperation between the school library and the public library. This is not an easy thing to achieve. It is essential, however, I believe, to have joint planning if we hope to have cooperative operation of services. This is self evident, but I think we tend to overlook the fact that the seeds for success in cooperative programs are sown in the planning stage. It is in this stage that mutual agreement must be reached as to goals, administrative procedures and feasibilities.

In all three library-oriented systems that I have discussed I have, somewhat arbitrarily, identified the common plan for each as cooperative arrangements to share resources and services. In the same high-handed manner, I have chosen a slightly different common purpose for each of the three. For the single library, it was putting knowledge to work. For the system of community services, it was satisfaction of individual needs. For the system of libraries, it was improvement of library service. The common purpose of library systems, therefore, might be restated as improvement of library service so that knowledge may be put to work to satisfy individual needs. Through this amalgam of purposes we identify the user, in our case a young person, as the target for planning.

So a concluding message is: *Begin with a commitment to* *cooperation and start at the grass roots where you can best look at resource and service needs from a user's point of view.*

I feel confident that Louisiana librarians who pioneered in improving library services by demonstrating the effectiveness of the parish system of public library services, will now find new ways to carry the systems concept forward. I feel equally sure that the guidelines you will develop for your state plan will not fit the third definition of system culled from Webster. The definition, as promised, has some bearing on service to youth. Here it is:

System--an organized society or social situation regarded as hampering, stifling or stultifying as in "beat the system."

References

The observations and suggestions contained in the foregoing paper are culled from many sources over a long period of time. While the ideas expressed are not original, it would be difficult to track down in every case the writer or speaker who sparked a train of thought. The following list, therefore, is only a partial acknowledgment of indebtedness.--Isobel P. Lynch

Agree, Rose H. "Will the Walls Come Tumbling Down?" Top of the News, 23:253-6, April 1967.

Barron, Robert E. "Towards a Common Goal; Cooperation--Signs of the Times," The Bookmark, 27:169-72, January 1968.

Barts, Alice P. "Media Resources Examination Center," PLA Bulletin, 24:248-51, September 1969.

Carnovsky, Leon, ed. Library Networks--Promise and Performance. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1969.

Connor, Jean L. "Stages in and Fields for Interlibrary Cooperation," The Bookmark, 27:13-18, October 1967.

Cory, John M. "Changing Patterns of Public Library and School Library Relationships," Library Trends, 17:424-33, April 1969.

Darling, Richard L. "More Honored in the Breach," Library Journal, 94:261-2, January 15, 1969.

Freiser, Leonard H. "Reconstruction of Library Services," in Linderman, Winifred B., ed., The Present Status and Future Prospects of Reference Information Service. Chicago: American Library Association, 1967, pp. 48-56.

Greenaway, Emerson. "The Public Library Lure," Library Journal, 94:263-4, January 15, 1969.

Havighurst, Robert J. "Educational Changes--Their Implications for the Library," *ALA Bulletin*, 61:537-43, May 1967.

Hefley, Sue. "The Webster Parish, Louisiana, Program," *Library Trends*, 16:461-71, April 1968.

Henne, Frances E. "The Move to School An Autonomy," *Library Journal*, 94:259-60, January 15, 1969.

Humphry, John A., and Humphry, James III, *Library Services in Louisiana*. New York, 1968.

Liesener, James W., and Olson, Edwin E. "Survey of User Services in Indiana School Libraries," *Hoosier School Libraries*, 8:7-9, Summer 1969.

Lindauer, Dinah. "Courtesy and Planned Cooperation," *Library Journal*, 94:266-8, January 15, 1969.

McJenkin, Virginia, ed. *Service to Students--A Joint Responsibility of School and Public Libraries*. Chicago: American Library Association, 1966. (A reprint for the American Association of School Librarians of articles which appeared in the *ALA Bulletin*, June 1965-January 1966.)

Mesiano, Lindalee. "Turbulent Generation; Public and School Librarians Discuss Their Material and Separate Responsibilities to Youth," *Library Journal*, 93:3210-15, September 15, 1968.

Moon, Eric. "A Many Splintered Thing," in Wisconsin Library Association, *Libraries in Transition*. Madison: Wisconsin Library Association, 1968, pp. 36-43.

Stone, C. Walter and others. *A Library Program for Columbia*. Pittsburgh: C. W. Stone, 1965. (o.p.)

"Student Library Resource Requirements in Philadelphia," *PLA Bulletin*, 24:51-3, January 1969.

Swank, Raymond C. "Partnerships in California: How Can Books and Information Be Mobilized for Every Californian?" *News Notes of California Libraries*, 63:419-28, Fall 1968.

ACADEMIC LIBRARY COOPERATION

by

Stephen A. McCarthy*

Ten years ago my topic and the appearance of an academic librarian speaking about academic libraries at an institute concerned with state-wide library service might have been considered unusual and somewhat out of place. This is not the case today. It seems normal and natural. This might be considered one measure of the distance that we have come in the sixties.

My purpose will be to review with you the major types or forms of cooperation undertaken by academic libraries; to note some of the cautions which, I think, academic librarians should have in mind as they consider cooperative undertakings; to observe why systems librarians might also keep these cautions in mind, and to identify some of the special problems which academic librarians face as they undertake responsibility for expanded services under cooperative arrangements. These problems, if not shared by systems librarians, must at least be understood by them. In some instances, there may be opportunities for systems librarians to assist in working toward the solution of some of these problems.

While the inclusion of academic libraries in an institute such as this may be considered a relatively new thing and something which has really come to the fore in the sixties, cooperation is an old word and an old practice among libraries. Libraries have been cooperating for many years and in a variety of ways. While such cooperation in very considerable part has been found principally among libraries of the same types, there have certainly been other instances in which the boundaries of types of libraries have been

---

**Dr. McCarthy is Executive Director of the Association of Research Libraries, Washington, D.C.*

crossed in the process of providing library service to those who wanted it or needed it.

Even though we have talked about and worked at library cooperation for many years, cooperation has been given new meanings and particularly new emphases in the 1960's. It has become a byword in higher education circles and in academic libraries. Librarians have been encouraged, challenged, directed or budgeted into cooperative endeavors in a way that has never happened before. This is new and different. It seeks to go farther and to do more than has ever been done before.

Some of these new efforts may already be called successful while others are in the try-out stage. Some others appear to be little more than paper cooperatives that have never left the ground or that have not yet found the areas and procedures that will enable them to accomplish something of significance. Regardless of the success or lack of it which has been achieved so far, it seems clear there will be continued and perhaps greater emphasis on cooperation as we move ahead into the 1970's.

On the face of it, it makes good sense. We librarians are committed to the view that those who need information and library services should have them. Good management dictates that these materials and services be provided efficiently. Although I do not equate efficiency with economy, I do believe that wasteful use of resources is not efficient. Thus *it seems that librarians must develop effective cooperative undertakings because governing boards, budgetary authorities, and the general public will demand it.*

I should like to turn now to some of the types of cooperative undertakings in which academic libraries have engaged or are now engaged with some comments on each of them. The types of cooperative undertakings which I should like to discuss include the following:

1. Interlibrary loan
2. Cooperative storage
3. Cooperative acquisitions

4. Cooperative processing
5. Union lists
6. General cooperative library programs

Interlibrary loan, I suppose, is the oldest form of academic library cooperation. You may consider it old hat and obvious and wonder why I include it. My reasons will become apparent in the next few pages. It started very simply as a device used by academic libraries to enable advanced students and faculty members to have the use of library materials in their local library which were not a part of the collections of that library. From simple beginnings and a small volume of materials requested and loaned, the interlibrary loan system developed steadily but gradually in the pre-war period. With the expansion of higher education which followed the war and which has gained in momentum and strength in the sixties, this relatively modest service has grown tremendously and has come to be a substantial, if not a major, activity for the larger academic libraries.

Changes and innovations in the interlibrary loan system have been developed to meet increased needs and volume of traffic. Photocopies have been substituted for the original book or journal. Teletype has been introduced to expedite the location of needed titles and to request loans. Delivery systems ranging from the rather simple to the very elaborate have been adopted as a means of expediting service. Staff members employed by borrowing libraries have been stationed in some of the larger libraries to service interlibrary loan requests with a minimum of dependence on the staff of the lending library. In some states, major academic libraries have even made commitments to honor requests for loans coming through a state system in return for remuneration by the state library.

Experimentation has been carried on in the use of telefacsimile as a means of transmitting material speedily, but up to the present time the results of these experiments have not been encouraging due to the quality of the reproduction, the relatively great length of time required for transmission and the cost.

In taking note of these developments in interlibrary loan, I think we should at the same time be mindful of the fact that there are many things about interlibrary loan on which our information is still inadequate. We do not, for example, know how satisfactory this service is to the user. Nor do we know what special and additional burdens it puts on him, nor the effect of these burdens on his work. From the other side of the coin, we must admit that where a loan involves lending the original material, we do not know what disservice to the local community results from the unavailability of books because they are out on interlibrary loan. This may be more serious than has been realized. As the volume of interlibrary loan increases, it could become even more serious.

We do not know yet how to figure the true cost of interlibrary loans either to the borrowing or to the lending institution. There are some obvious costs which can be recorded. There are other costs which are far more difficult to identify and, indeed, there may be a difference of opinion as to whether or not they are appropriately regarded as part of the cost of interlibrary loan.

We badly need a thorough study of the entire subject of interlibrary loan as an important means of access to information in the latter part of the twentieth century. Even before such a study is made, we may find that some academic libraries which estimate their interlibrary lending costs at figures ranging from $50,000 to $100,000 per year will decide that it is necessary to introduce an interlibrary loan charge.

We should also be mindful of the fact that the expansion, expediting, and improvement of interlibrary loan procedures have gone along with or are part of a change in our basic attitude toward interlibrary loan. Instead of being a means by which in a modest way a local collection can be supplemented for the use of a particular reader on a temporary basis, the program adopted by the Ontario university libraries, for example, represents an entirely different approach.

This program was the result of a survey of graduate work and research as it was expected to occur in this group of fourteen

Ontario universities. The library collections of most of the institutions were seriously inadequate to support graduate and research programs. The estimated cost of developing these collections to a level considered appropriate for advanced work was very high. The deliberate decision was therefore made that the program was not feasible and could not be supported, but that a greatly stepped-up interlibrary loan service would be a means of meeting this need. The program to date is considered successful and negotiations are now underway for including the French-speaking universities in Quebec as part of the program.

A second area in which our philosophy regarding interlibrary loans has changed has occurred in such states as New York and New Jersey in which the major research libraries have accepted a responsibility to make the materials in their collections available to residents of the state who require them through a state program of library service developed under the aegis of the state library.

These two changes are, I believe, of major importance. I do not think we realize yet what their full effect may be. I think they are particularly important in relation to the two questions raised about reader satisfaction on the borrowing end and reader dissatisfaction on the lending end.

Thus, at the end of the 1960's we have a greatly expanded interlibrary loan system and one which in some respects, at least, represents a change in philosophy. Yet, we do not know the answers to several of the basic questions with respect to interlibrary loan.

Cooperative storage, if it is merely the sharing of storage facilities by several academic libraries, is not by itself a very productive cooperative venture, although there are instances in which it has provided great relief for academic libraries. *The value of cooperative storage is to be found in the steps which may follow from it,* such as disposal of duplicates and cooperative acquisitions programs. The principal example of the second kind of cooperative storage is represented by the Center for Research Libraries in Chicago which, starting from a regional base, has now become a national institution serving libraries from coast to coast.

Cooperative acquisition does not necessarily involve cooperative storage. We are all familiar with examples of neighboring libraries which by agreement have developed their collections along various specialized lines and have avoided or minimized duplications in subjects outside the field of specialization. Similarly, the Farmington Plan and the PL 480 Program have involved cooperative acquisitions on a national scale without cooperative storage. Cooperative acquisitions, on the other hand, with cooperative storage have been a major feature of the Center for Research Libraries from its inception.

In the view of proponents of these plans, it seems reasonable, especially in the case of infrequently used material, to apply the cooperative principle at the outset rather than at the end of the process. If cooperative acquisitions can meet the needs satisfactorily, they result in great savings to all participants because they not only avoid the full initial purchase price, but also avoid all of the costs associated with the work of acquisitions, cataloging, processing, and shelving of the materials.

Perhaps the greatest stimulus in the past few years to cooperative purchasing has been the program under Title II-A of the Higher Education Act of 1965. Under this program, Special Purpose Grants Type C are intended to stimulate groups of libraries to present proposals for grants which would enable them to acquire materials for common use. As you know, this program has been successful and has led to many applications of this type which have been funded under this program.

Still another type of cooperative acquisition is exemplified by the Center for Chinese Research Materials established at the Association of Research Libraries in 1968 through a grant from the Ford Foundation. The purpose of this center is to make more accessible to American libraries research materials dealing with contemporary China, which are available in this country in only a limited number of copies. The thought behind the center is that it should identify materials that are needed and should arrange for their reproduction in microfilm, Xerox copies or printed form through a selection, reproduction, and sales program.

Individual libraries that are interested in acquiring these materials pay for them, but the cooperative process has entered the picture at an earlier stage by making the material available for these libraries to purchase. Without the center, the individual libraries might search out the desired titles in the collections of other libraries and arrange to have copies made. The center is conceived as a means by which this can be done once for all libraries interested instead of putting the burden on each library to find and acquire these materials themselves. In addition to its primary task of reproducing scarce materials, this center has undertaken a number of special bibliographic and indexing projects intended to facilitate the use of research materials on contemporary China.

Cooperative processing is not new and cooperative cataloging is very old indeed. Public libraries have made far more progress in developing cooperative processing than have academic libraries. It may be that this results from the greater need or the supposed greater need for a higher degree of bibliographic sophistication in academic library cataloging, or it may be attributed to the difficulties which are inherent in cooperative projects of this kind.

Nevertheless, we are now witnessing a number of major efforts to make cooperative processing work for groups of academic libraries and the results to date appear to be promising. Despite the shortcomings of these projects, it seems that the arguments in favor of cooperative processing are so persuasive that somehow *the difficulties must be overcome and cooperative processing made a reality for academic libraries.*

The principal activities of this kind, of which I am aware, are going on in the state of Colorado where the University of Colorado is conducting a cooperative processing operation for all of the state institutions; in Boston where, under contract, Inforonics Incorporated is providing cooperative processing for a group of New England libraries; and, more recently and just getting under way, a cooperative acquisitions and processing center for a group of predominantly Negro colleges in the Atlanta area.

Union lists of various kinds, but principally of serials, have long been a favorite project in library cooperation generally, and perhaps especially among academic libraries. In the case of very large institutions it may take a great deal of library cooperation to produce a union list for the institution itself. But, generally, when we speak of "union lists" we refer to lists which cover the holdings of more than one library. Frequently the libraries of a city or region, sometimes the libraries of a state, or of a larger region including several or more states are included. In addition, there are union lists in various special subject fields such as the Union Catalog of Medical Periodicals compiled by the Medical Library Center of New York.

The emphasis on sharing resources, making access to resources more convenient and the application of computer technology have given a special impetus to the production of union lists in the past few years. Depending on the skill and imagination of the programmers and technicians and on the availability of equipment, some of these lists have been produced in very ingenious ways and can be adapted to the benefit of libraries that are not members of the original group.

There has been a good deal of individual initiative in the development of union lists, with the result that there is a *lack of compatibility* among the records produced and there has been little or no transfer of the computer software. Many of the same tasks have been repeated frequently in a manner which can only be characterized as wasteful and inefficient, because there has been no agreed national standard which is recommended for use by all libraries compiling such lists.

It is to be hoped that the new National Serials Pilot Project undertaken by the Association of Research Libraries for the National Libraries Task Force may lead to the adoption of a format that will become the standard format and henceforth be used in all lists of this kind which have, or may have, application beyond the clearly local. The National Serials Pilot Project is just getting under way and it is too early to predict what the outcome of this special effort may be.

In addition to the specific types of cooperation just discussed, there a number of groups of academic libraries of varying sizes generally consisting of libraries of a given region that have entered into cooperative ventures that are open-ended. By this I mean they are committed to undertake various cooperative projects resulting from studies and experiments indicating the areas in which they can work cooperatively to achieve useful results.

It is not possible to estimate the number of cooperatives of this kind, but there is evidence that it is far from negligible. As these libraries try to advance their cooperative projects, what are some of things to which they turn attention? One of the first steps usually is to try to improve interlibrary loans through faster delivery service of both requests and loans. A second stage common to many of these projects is the extension of direct borrowing privileges either to the entire constituency of the cooperating libraries or to certain sections of it, such as faculty, graduate students, etc. A problem frequently encountered here is that of appropriate identification cards which will correctly activate the mechanical or electronic charging systems being used by the several libraries in the group.

Cooperative acquisitions is another element in many cooperative programs. To make this work in a regular and routine way requires the exchange of information at the time of acquisition. This may become complicated and difficult if the cooperating libraries are at different stages of automation, if they have non-compatible machine records or, if some are automated and others are not.

Compatibility of machine-readable records in libraries would seem to be of the very greatest importance if cooperative undertakings are to succeed.

It is, of course, one thing to say this and it is quite another thing for a library to discard or re-do its records in order to achieve compatibility with the group.

Similar problems arise, or at least may arise, at many points in the operating procedures of libraries as they try to share their resources and services. This is part of the cost of improving and strengthening services beyond levels which the individual libraries could achieve by themselves. Substantial progress has been made in a number of situations, perhaps in many, but in others serious difficulties have arisen. It will take patience, skill, and ingenuity to work them out on a basis that is physically and economically viable.

In this same general area of broad cooperation on as many fronts as possible, I think that we should take note of the National Libraries Task Force formed in 1967 as an instrument to assist the three national libraries--the Library of Congress, the National Library of Medicine, and the National Agricultural Library--to cooperate in areas beneficial to them and to make their services as useful as possible to the American library community.

To this last end, an advisory committee to the National Libraries Task Force was appointed shortly after the announcement of the Task Force itself. This advisory committee is made up of representatives of the major library associations. The purpose of the committee is to serve as a channel of information to the Task Force on the needs of the member libraries of the various associations and to act as a channel from the Task Force itself back to the member libraries of the several associations. There is reason to believe that progress has been made, although perhaps this advisory committee and its functions have not become as well known as would be desirable.

A second step, which it is hoped will contribute to the same end, is the recently formed Task Force on Library Programs of the Committee on Scientific and Technical Information, COSATI. The purpose of this committee is to seek means of making federal library and information resources available to the research library community of the country in whatever ways and through whatever means may appear most suitable and feasible.

The organization of the Task Force is based on recognition of the great wealth of library information resources of the federal government and the further recognition that if these resources are to be used to the best advantage in the national interest, their availability through the research libraries of the nation must be improved and enhanced. COSATI is still in the formative stages, and it is not possible yet to predict what it may achieve, but its objectives are certainly such as to command the interest and support of all librarians.

What are some of the results that may be expected to flow from various academic library cooperative undertakings?

The impetus for some cooperative undertakings has been an effort to save money. My experience has indicated that if this is the primary objective, not only will the cooperative undertaking fail, but the participating institutions will also fail to save money. Most cooperative undertakings involve some additional commitment of funds at the outset. They may also involve additional staff commitments. Such use of funds and staff should be looked upon as an *investment* which in time will repay the principal with interest.

Another approach is to say that with a given amount of financial resources available to a group, the amount could be spend independently and heedless of unnecessary duplication of collections and services while cooperatively a portion of the funds available could be used for nonduplicative materials and services which would be available on a shared basis to all participants. Individually, each member might have given up something in the cooperative plan in order for each member to have a share in a much larger whole.

If this is the objective--the best service possible to all users--participation in the cooperative plan, with consequent enrichment of available resources is clearly the right step to take. If, however, the concentration is on developing the local collection to the fullest possible extent regardless of what others do, then the cooperative way is not the way to go.

Better services can be achieved as the result of cooperative undertakings, but only to the extent that *all participants are* *freely and fully committed to the goal of better service.* This means that, in addition to sharing the cooperative aspects of the service, each member must ensure that the final payoff is achieved by providing local in-house service of the highest quality possible. Here again, the diversion of financial support, and possibly of staff support, to engage in the cooperative enterprise becomes an added cost to the cooperators. But, it is a cost they must be prepared to meet, if in turn they expect other members of the cooperative to participate fully in behalf of the service to their own local readers.

Thus, I believe that academic librarians have a responsibility to their administrative superiors as well as to their constituency to make clear what cooperative projects will mean in the way of increased responsibilities. Some sacrifices must be made in order that the users of the cooperative program as a whole may have improved and enriched services. This may not work out for a single individual in a given instance, but if it is viewed in a larger perspective, a strong case can be made in support of the cooperative.

What can systems librarians do to assist academic librarians? And what can academic librarians do to assist systems librarians in their common effort to try to supply the library and information needs of their respective constituents? I think there are a number of things and I should like to discuss them.

First of all, *we need to understand each other better,* and we need to understand better the problems which confront both the academic librarian and the systems librarian. The academic librarian has come a long way, I think, in accepting the view that he has a responsibility to make the resources of his library as broadly available to competent users as possible. This I regard as the significant change which has come gradually over a period of years.

At the same time, the academic librarian is aware and must remain aware that the collections under his care have been assembled for a particular purpose and to serve a particular clientele. His problem then is to strike a balance and decide between the needs and services of his special clientele for which the academic library exists, and other users or potential users who have some claim on access to the materials but not the primary claim.

I think that librarians who are not in an academic setting sometimes forget this special responsibility and fail to understand the pressures on the campus which the academic librarian cannot ignore. Some decisions that may appear arbitrary are made in this context. An appreciation of that fact would be helpful.

A second area in which I believe a fuller understanding of the situation of the academic library on the part of the systems librarian and other librarians that might be requesting materials or services is *the appreciation of the costs that are involved for the academic library.*

One must remember that the academic library has been created with funds especially provided for that purpose either through legislative appropriations or through an allocation from tuition and other institutional income. The costs of rendering whatever type of cooperative service is requested must come out of funds available to the academic library.

These funds were made available to serve the particular academic community. Requests for cooperative services may impose severe burdens and greatly added costs that the academic library may not be capable of sustaining on its normal revenues. Recognition of this fact, at least in part, has been made in such states as New York and New Jersey.

In addition to the actual costs of rendering the particular service or making available the item requested, there is the very great cost involved in developing the collections and providing the staff which makes it possible to respond to the request at all. Is this a cost which should be borne *entirely* by the lending academic library? I am sure there will be differences of opinion on this question.

One answer is that an interlibrary loan charge should not include part of the amortization cost of the collection. The argument is that the owning library had acquired the material for its own purposes and, therefore, no additional cost is involved. This answer assumes that the only costs are the ad hoc costs of making a loan or giving a service at the time it is requested. Perhaps a good case can be made for that point of view. But there is certainly another point of view.

It might be argued, for example, that library X has a large and diversified collection which it has built up over a period of years at very substantial costs to the institution. Although it is true that the collection was assembled to support the work of the institution without the expectation of contributions from potential outside users, the existence of the collection leads to requests for use from others. When this occurs, is it unreasonable to ask that some method of helping to defray the cost of developing and maintaining the collection be borne by such users, or on their behalf? I think a case can be made for such support. It seems to me that the state plan in New Jersey, for instance, recognizes and accepts this principle.

Consider the present state of large academic libraries. Many of them are now growing at the rate of 100,000 to 200,000 volumes per year. Projecting these figures 10, 20, or 50 years ahead produces collections of mammoth size. The projections also lead to very large costs for storage and staff, and this at a time of severe financial austerity. How are these costs to be met? *Is this not an area in which cooperation is inescapable?*

As we look ahead, and as we think of library cooperation in the terms in which we have known it, it is hard to avoid the question, "Do we have the right answers?" Or, "Do we need new devices, new institutions, new methods by which cooperatively we may be enabled to deal effectively with the problem?"

We have all heard and read about the wonderful day to come when by using the telephone, the TV set, or a new electronic gadget right in our homes or in our study rooms, we can ask any questions which occur to us and in a very short time we can read off the answers from some kind of terminal or visual display. It is another version of 2001 in which the hero David Bowman reads the daily newspapers transmitted from the earth and flashed on the screen in his cabin as he races toward Jupiter at 100,000 miles per hour. This time may come and libraries and information centers may become vestigial. But, they are not vestigial now.

Clearly, librarians and libraries must go through many changes, must adopt many new techniques and procedures, and must have new instruments to cover the gulf between where we are and where we may be going. It seems to me that this places a premium on cooperation among all types of libraries. This cooperation will only succeed to the extent that it is soundly conceived and that the cooperators are all prepared to carry *their full share* of the burden.

We must be willing to work together toward the goal of meeting the library and information needs of our people to the fullest possible extent.

THE ACADEMIC AND SPECIAL LIBRARY IN RELATION TO THE SYSTEM

by

Catherine S. Chadwick*

In our discussion of the Black Gold Cooperative System, I ended my talk with the opening of an information center which has proved to be the most exciting feature of the program.

A few months before the Black Gold Information Center was established, informal relationships developed with a new college in our area. The academic institution, Moorpark College, employed a most progressive president and librarian, both of whom appeared on the scene a year before the college was actually to go into operation. The president was eager to know and to work with all the educational facilities in the area. The librarian introduced himself promptly as desiring to cooperate with all types of libraries and planning to use the Library of Congress system as a basis for his cataloging program.

He approached the Black Gold System with the request that we consider the possibility of cataloging and processing books for Moorpark College, and suggested the possibility of being included in our book form catalog. This last proved to be impossible, but the processing center did undertake the cataloging and processing of all books that went into the Moorpark College library. In addition, we provided the college with the cumulations and the continuing supplements to our book form catalog and gave them free borrowing and interlibrary loan privileges.

Based on this informal cooperation, last year a formal application for funds was made to the California State Library under Title III of the Library Services Construction Act. Those funds

---

Mrs. Chadwick is Administrative Librarian of the Black Gold Cooperative Library System and Librarian at the Ventura County and City Library, Ventura, California.

then enabled Moorpark College to be added to the closed circuit teletype of the Black Gold System and to be included in a union list of serials which was published this past year. Other cooperative aids during the year have been the use of the information center, accessible through teletype and a strong program of interlibrary loan.

Our success with Moorpark College has been noted in many talks and papers given on the subject of cooperation among types of libraries. Due to this, application was made this past year for a Title III grant to include all special and academic libraries in the area. A total of 22 libraries signed the application including the first group of Black Gold libraries and headed up by the University of California in Santa Barbara.

Though we have not as yet received acceptance of our program, the activities are continuing and strengthening with the addition of other special libraries. Daily our information center station wagon goes to UCSB where our researchers find answers and copy materials which are used throughout the system and even in exchange with other library systems throughout California and elsewhere.

Special libraries have found that our system activities are very useful. Some which formerly made biweekly trips to UCLA no longer need to do this because they can get the information they need through our information center.

The information center has been the strongest factor in attracting the academic libraries. Most of them are using LC cataloging and have their own policies and programs which would be impractical to share with the public libraries. However, *the need for information is universal,* and our information center has been able to supply much needed and hard to get information for the smaller colleges and on occasion the special libraries.

In doing this, we have adopted patterns which probably would be looked on with much disfavor by some librarians who are more closely tied up to rules and regulations than we are. We have felt that *the only really important thing was to get the information to the patron as rapidly as possible* when he needs it and not at some later date. Therefore, we have disregarded and bypassed many of the shibboleths of accepted library practice.

We no longer go through all the routines that have become customary in many libraries for safeguarding collections. Using our own people and simplified formalities such as loan forms along with the wholehearted support of University of California at Santa Barbara and other agencies which see the value of immediate answer rather than the formality, we have cut into the length of time formerly considered normal for answering information questions.

All this has not been without its pain and anguish, however, since many interlibrary loan outlets have had such long established practices as accumulating all the questions for a certain length of time, in some cases a week, and then sending them, along with the unwillingness of some staff members to use the teletype, lack of accuracy in describing the items needed and a state of mind that would rather say "no" than "yes" in some cases.

These handicaps have had to be overcome and not only overcome once but constantly guarded against, since people fall back easily into established habits. Additionally, we cannot expect that our clerical staff will understand and sympathize with the urgency felt by our patrons since the staff members sometimes do not understand or sympathize with such needs.

Some of our Title III affiliates, as we have called them, are hospital libraries and have very special requirements and special abilities to serve in ways in which it would not be possible for public libraries to become knowledgeable. In our tri-counties area we have such institutions as Atascadero Hospital which treats sex offenders and has a professional library which would include materials which, while normally not made available to public library patrons, might on occasion be helpful to physicians or surgeons or psychologists in some other area of the state.

We have Camarillo State Hospital and the facility for men, and to them we offer not only books and the availability of materials through our book form catalog, but we also offer and provide them with film service, information service and whatever helpful services we can allow. We are hoping that when funds may become available to the Title III project we may be able to make these services more available through added personal contact, although they are now being given on an informal and volunteer basis. Our objective is TOTAL LIBRARY SERVICE involving all library-type institutions, in order to provide the citizens of our area with every possible library service.

To quote from Raynard Swank who in his Interlibrary Cooperation Under Title III of the Library Services and Construction Act (California State Library, 1967) says: "It is the new Title III of the LSCA, however, that puts the question of coordination among the several types of libraries squarely before the library community. The Act continues to support the development of exclusively public library systems in the several states, but it also points clearly to the desirability of breaking down old barriers and habits of thought and of stimulating joint action among public, school, academic and special libraries. Federal funds, as well as state funds, are now becoming widely available through legislative acts to school, college, and university libraries, as well as public libraries, and through research and development contracts also to special libraries in business and industrial firms. Assurance is sought that these funds do in fact serve the general interest in the most economical and efficient manner. Title III has arisen from, and is attached to, the LSCA."

Joseph Becker and Robert Hayes in their Proposed Library Network for Washington State have written: "Because of the unique nature of the public library enterprise, a strong case can be made for the special responsibility of public libraries and public library systems to exercise their full capacity for leadership in bringing about an effective articulation of all segments of the library effort in the communities and regions which they serve. . . . Continued progress in library service will depend increasingly on greater sharing of resources and closer interrelationships between types of libraries. . . . Plans for public library system development should recognize that the advanced reference and information needs of users will require the use of resources of academic and special libraries and non-library information networks."

In the end it is the urgency, the desire to give service, the belief in knowledge and information as a saving force in our society that will bring library service to reality and acceptance. Without this urgency and willingness to cut through red tape to get the answer to the patron, no network can succeed.

I will close with the wise observations of Joseph Wheeler:

> Unless librarians wish to see the public use its libraries less and less, libraries need a drastic revolution in their philosophy and methods:
>
> a) to imbue every person in each library organization, at all levels, with the conviction that satisfactory service to each individual user, old and young, shall have first priority, and to find the ways to accomplish this;
>
> b) to realize that books, reading, and information seeking are of paramount and increasing value and importance to society, and that Reading will continue to be First of the Three R's;
>
> c) to speed up the availability of reader materials: promptness and haste are not synonymous;'
>
> d) to pay more attention to readers' frustrations and to invite and follow up on their criticisms as to library operations and services;
>
> e) to concertedly seek ways to improve present services so as to satisfy all categories of users, including the underprivileged;
>
> f) to organize, finance, and pursue a continuing nationwide effort, backed by the head and staff of every local library, to attract 75 per cent, instead of 25 or 30 per cent, of normal intelligent citizens above college age, to use their libraries, to do more good reading, to look up more reference-informational questions of a significant sort, and to use this information in their daily lives. Not many libraries are even trying with any determination to do the foregoing, which among other things means a constant flow of publicity and good public relations.[1]

---

[1] Joseph L. Wheeler, "Top Priority for Cataloging," Library Journal, 94:3008, September 15, 1969.

A LOUISIANA LIBRARY SYSTEM--FOCUS ON FUNDING

by

S. Janice Kee*

There is a lot of talk these days about "revenue sharing." The President of the United States is advocating it; the Congressmen are discussing it; and editorials are being written about it, while the man on the street is asking the basic question. What is it? Offhand, it appears to be a desirable and simple thing of the federal government's returning a share of its tax revenues to the states, counties, cities and towns.

More desirable perhaps than simple is the proposed revenue sharing plan. A number of straightforward questions are being asked about the method of distribution, the readiness and fiscal capacity, and the willingness of the states to handle the demands for expanded public service. And, the age-old question of whether or not "strings will be attached" is heard everywhere.

In the business of library systems development, professionals have something of the same kind of problem. We talk about sharing resources. We have embraced the concept. We believe in it, for, in some places, we have observed its workability, and its clearcut advantages to the library user. There are, however, some fundamental questions still unanswered about pooling and sharing library resources. One of these is how to place the price tags where they rightfully belong. In other words, what is a participant's fair share of the total cost of a cooperative library operation? On what basis can and should the share be determined?

These kinds of questions make dedicated, service-oriented

**Miss Kee is Library Services Program Officer, Bureau of Adult, Vocational and Library Programs, United States Office of Education, Region VII, Dallas, Texas. The region includes Arkansas, Louisiana, New Mexico, Oklahoma and Texas.*

librarians uncomfortable. They are not generally raised by librarians--even by the most self-confident of the younger library administrators. These are the questions coming from the increasing number of professionals in governmental and other agencies and institutions whose imposing working titles include the words manager, analyst, planner or research.

It has never been a simple matter to put a price on library service and it is becoming more and more complicated. The underlying problem is, perhaps, more social than economic. This is to say it may be more difficult to establish the need for the library system product as packaged by professionals than it is to establish the responsibility for a fair share payment and efficiently administer the system funds.

Recall for a moment the findings of the 1968-69 national survey on barriers to interlibrary cooperation. In Nolting's report of the 10 regional conferences on this subject, he classified 46 barriers as psychological, traditional and historical, physical and geographical, legal and administrative, and those based on lack of information and experience. However, in summary, Mr. Nolting said that "most of the barriers are not real. Many are based on false assumptions, some are excuses and still others are arguments for cooperation."[1]

It is not the purpose of this paper to discuss the pros and cons of library systems. Nolting's report notwithstanding, two assumptions are made as we focus on funding systems:

(1) there is a need to develop systems of library services, and

(2) sound and adequate financing is an essential part of the strength of a library system.

These assumptions are not exactly new, but they are receiving renewed consideration in terms of library funding.

Hannis Smith, in a thoughtful article on the systems approach to library service, said as a matter of principles of organization and administration: "The public library system must have a sound base of tax support--a tax base composed of local, state and federal aid funds."[2] It is generally accepted that there are now three major sources of library funds.

Maryann Duggan, in a recent address on library network analysis theory, outlined 12 critical components of a network, and the first on the list related to structure and financing. She said a network must have an "organization structure that provides for fiscal and legal responsibility, planning and policy formulation. . . ."[3] Planning and policy making are coupled with funding.

The National Advisory Commission on Libraries of 1968 reinforced the need for reconsideration of library support patterns in these words: "The nation's library and other information systems will continue to be a shared responsibility of Federal agencies, the states, municipalities, educational institutions and many other public and private organizations . . . new systems, roles and relationships are likely to emerge . . . the tasks of analyzing the needs, planning, setting standards, allocating resources, measuring performance and coordinating efforts will be difficult and complex in the years ahead . . . the principal need is to create new machinery for continuing examination of changing library needs, for devising means of meeting them and for determining priorities and costs."[4]

The need for a new look at the problem and methods of securing adequate financial support for library systems on a fair share basis is obvious. There is in evidence a core of library administrators who are concerned about the future success of library development unless ways are found to more satisfactorily:

(a) formulate library plans, policies and objectives in meaningful terms--apropos of the '70's.

(b) design appropriate library programs to achieve these modern objectives.

(c) evaluate library programs on a continuous basis in terms of the value of the services to the users and to society, and

(d) develop a set of principles for establishing statewide financial plans for library operations--plans which consider both source of funds and identification of cost items and the distribution of these costs.

The economists, the management analysts, the budget officers, and more lately, the elected officials are requiring librarians in an increasing number of places to document their budget requests in more scientific terms.

It appears that the library profession is approaching the 70's--by and large--without portfolio on "A Pricing-structure," "Pricing Mechanisms" and the necessary ingredients for a "Program Planning Budget."

Let me hasten to assure you the author of this paper does not aim to provide the portfolio, but rather to recognize the need for a serious look at the problems in financing jointly sponsored library operations, to discuss the concept of sharing in terms of library funding and to suggest some approaches for developing a financial plan for a statewide library system in Louisiana.

Planning, Programming and Budgeting

In considering the question of funding any kind of library system, the goals, the objectives, the responsibilities and the functions of the system must be clearly enunciated. Without a positive purpose, well-defined programs and clarification of the parameters of a system, evaluation is impossible. And, justification for funding is difficult, if not impossible.

A plan and program descriptions come first; the pricing, last! This the theory of the PPBS (Planning, Programming, Budgeting System initiated in the federal government in 1961), and it is also the principle supporting the practice of making federal planning grants before operational funds for a new program are available.

It is regrettable that state librarians have been known to look at the amount of the federal grant of some $40,000 for interlibrary cooperation and try to decide what to do with it, irrespective of how this amount, ever so small, might further the state's interlibrary cooperation goals (non-existent, perhaps).

Now, it is widely accepted that librarians everywhere, of all types, face the problem of limited funds. This condition is strong reason to make plans and to carefully devise programs, set priorities, and establish a phase-in timetable in order to make the best possible use of the amount that is available. According to scanty reports available to me, expenditures for all types of libraries in Louisiana in 1967-68 totaled over $16 million, which is no small amount of money, yet insufficient to meet needs.

One of the functions of budgeting is making comparisons and the necessary adjustments or compromises among programs. The time of budget preparation is the time for appraisal, for fact gathering, for analysis and priority setting.

While the point may seem obvious, may I repeat: Planning and programming come before budgeting and pricing.

Louisiana is nationally recognized as being a state with a long-range goal for public library development which was to achieve complete coverage of local tax support for public library purposes on a parish basis. This goal, set by the Louisiana State Library Commission in the late 1920's with Miss Essae Mae Culver as its great library leader, was reached after 40 years of a concentrated program of library demonstrations and local campaigns for tax support. This fine record is known and has had the commendation of the whole library world.

It is significant to note that well before the last parish library demonstration, the state library was looking ahead, recognizing the need for new goals for interlibrary services on a multi-parish base. The 1966-67 survey of Louisiana libraries by John and James Humphry[5] with the related work by statewide committees need only be mentioned here as an excellent example of systematic long-range planning.

The Humphry study prepared the way for the articulation of statewide interlibrary cooperation goals, while it made only very general recommendations on financing the proposed jointly sponsored regional library systems. Within the last three years, there have been published two national studies of library systems development[6] and numerous statewide studies and/or surveys.[7] In this same period, national standards for library functions at the state level and for public library systems have been revised.[8] System financing, in all of these, is treated in bare descriptive and general terms. It is the common practice of modern library surveyors to leave the details of financing for the state to work out.

The problem is that the states, like the surveyors, have tended to ignore or soft pedal the real cost aspects of library development for fear the facts would be too harsh for public acceptance. The public is apt to respond to the idea of sharing funds. It has a good ring to it, and it might be looked upon as an economic virtue.

Sharing Resources and Revenues

The concept of sharing has many dimensions in library systems development, some very old and some new.

The oldest form of library cooperation is simply interlibrary lending among independent libraries on a reciprocal basis. Public and school and some college libraries have a long record of sharing materials resources on the community level, with no money exchanged. The county library movement, and later, multi-county development, was, in effect, an early form of sharing municipal and county tax revenues for library purposes.

In 31 states, state aid programs have provided another share of revenues. The organization of federated groups of libraries, formed to improve the quality of public library service, flourished with the first federal aid program for public libraries about 12 years ago. The interlibrary cooperation program, initiated with the addition of Title III to the Library Services and Construction Act in 1966, brought a new emphasis on sharing among all types of libraries and the need for consideration of appropriate fiscal agreements.

Among other national developments that have emphasized the need for establishing some principles of revenue sharing among libraries is the demand for rapid flow of information and the technological inventions to make it possible. Such access systems as MEDLARS, Union Lists of Serials, Chemical Abstracts and MARC tapes demonstrate the capability of pooling and sharing in modern times.

Questions on pooling and sharing resources have been considered in such high level planning conferences as the 1965 Project Intrex, Information Transfer Experiments,[9] and the 1967 summer study on Information Networks, conducted by the Inter-University Communication Council (EDUCOM).[10]

In these meetings, librarians discussed networking with scientists, engineers, economists, researchers, psychologists, information technology specialists, industrialists, political scientists and public administrators. Access to stored information on a national basis calls for sharing resources of a new sort, which include not only library materials but computer resources, data resources, teacher and student resources and experimental know-how. In both of these conferences, the problem of equitable cost distribution was recognized but no methodology was recommended without further demonstration and study.

A search of library literature indicates that there has been in the last 10 years an increasing interest in improving library management practices, including financial matters, and these efforts should not be minimized. In 1963, the Library of Congress took steps to apply mechanization to its total bibliographic system, with careful attention to conversion and operating costs.[11] In 1967, the University of Illinois sponsored an Allerton House Conference on Measurement and Evaluation which examined, but did not solve, the complex problems librarians face in establishing meaningful quantitative units of service.[12]

One of the special studies for the National Commission on Libraries was one on the Economics of Library Operations. In this study, which was based on scant available data, economists wrestled with the question of what constitutes "the product" of library service, recognized the external benefits of libraries and finally chose circulation, as "the product" defined broadly to include in—library use, as well as lending.[13]

A recent research project was at the Aerospace Research Application Center at Indiana University on accounting techniques in a technical information center, and the conclusion was that "sound managerial accounting techniques definitely are applicable to an information center."[14]

Special kinds of cost studies have been made in recent months at the Bibliographic Center for Research, Denver (unpublished), and of Southern Methodist University's Industrial Information Services project in Dallas.[15]

A series of important research projects are currently underway, known as the Indiana Library Studies, sponsored by the Indiana State Library. It is expected that one of these will treat the economic aspects of public library service.

The Washington State Library is the recipient of a USOE research grant for the construction of a decision-making model for library network implementation in Washington state. Another USOE research project is in process at the Florida State University on state library legislation, including financial support for library development and operation.

It is encouraging also to note that approximately 15 of the training institutes for library personnel under Title IIB of the Higher Education Act held in the last three years have considered topics related to library management--e.g., system analysis as applied to libraries, middle management in libraries, mechanization and automation, personnel utilization and interlibrary cooperation. One, at Wayne University, was on program planning and budgeting systems for libraries.

However, from all accounts, it appears that if any sound managerial cost-accounting operations are in existence, they are in experimental stages.

At this point, the distinction between funding on which we are focusing and costing should be made. Funding relates to income and source of income. Costing relates to expenditures. It is the process of determining the cost of service, a unit of service, if possible. There are fixed costs and variable costs. There are direct costs and indirect costs. The term cost allocation has come into common use, and it means distributing or assigning costs to participants in a joint operation.

Historically, librarians, as has been indicated earlier, have been more concerned with funding (where is the money coming from?) than with costing (what is the cost of an interlibrary loan transaction? Or what does it cost to operate the children's department?).

The current patterns for funding public library systems are based on a set of widely accepted principles.[16] They are, briefly, as follows:

1. A combination of local, state and federal funds should be provided for the public support of library systems.
2. State aid should be both aid in the form of services and grants-in-aid to localities.
3. State grants-in-aid programs should be designed to assure equalization of opportunity and incentive to achieve quality in library service.
4. Localities should show a reasonable degree of effort to provide adequate financial support as a prerequisite to a grant-in-aid from the state.
5. Every effort should be made to build on the strength of existing library and information resource centers, with adequate remuneration of these centers for their services.

State aid laws for interlibrary cooperation, per se, are nonexistent. Developing such legislation may be the great challenge for Louisiana.

Source of Funds

With the advent of the national effort in promoting what has been called creative federalism or a working partnership among federal, state, and local governments, new emphasis has been placed on the question of source of funds for all public services, including library development. While library development is primarily a local and state responsibility, but also a national concern, a federal share has come to be expected in consideration of source of library funds. A state share for public library development comes in the form of direct services from state agencies in 31 states and grants-in-aid to localities in many of these states.

The state's share is the major source of funds for public supported academic libraries, but not so for public school libraries. In any case, all sources of revenue, including private funds, should be considered in financial planning.

It was Dr. Joeckel, in 1948, who introduced the formula of 60 per cent local, 25 per cent state and 15 per cent federal as fair share of revenues for developing a national public library system.[17]

Smith, in 1961, made a case for public library systems support on the basis of 40 per cent local, 40 per cent state and 20 per cent federal.[18]

In 1965, the tax shares for public library systems in New York state were reported to be 76 per cent local, 17 per cent state, and 7 per cent federal.[19]

Goldstein, in his study of public library services in Kansas in 1968, recommended local, state and federal proportions for public library development as 30-35 per cent local, 60-70 per cent state, and 5 per cent federal.

The Humphrys have recommended 60 per cent local, 25 per cent state, and 15 per cent federal as a fair share formula for Louisiana.

Judging from the differences in these several proposed shares of governmental support, it appears highly unlikely that a national formula will ever be acceptable, but such a formula is needed for each state in developing a statewide financial plan. The formula should be based on criteria which reflect the state's library standards, the taxing ability of the different levels of government, the precedents as in public school support and possibly the political traditions of the state.

Let us, by example, test Louisiana's recommended standard of $5.00 per capita for public library system development and its recommended fair share formula of 60 per cent local, 25 per cent state and 15 per cent federal. The 1968 estimated population of the state is approximately 3,740,000. For library systems, the amount of $18,700,000 is needed, of which $11,220,000 should be raised locally; $4,675,000 should be provided by the state, and $2,805,000 should come from federal funds.

How does this compare with reality? Annual reports of the Louisiana State Library show expenditures for public libraries of approximately $7,375,000 from local sources, $294,000 from state, and $1,500,000 from federal. The local effort is nearest the standard. Localities are supporting libraries at a 65 per cent level, the state at a 6 per cent level, and the federal at a level of 54 per cent.

It is obvious that the state's share is a mere token. Why is this when the state collects more than half Louisiana's total general revenue? I want to read to you a paragraph from a speech made in 1968 by Dr. Bernard F. Sliger of Louisiana State University:

"In comparing Louisiana with other states, figures on state and local revenue and expenditures indicate that we receive relatively large amounts of federal grants--27 per cent of the total in 1966. And, in turn, we display a high degree of fiscal centralization within the state. Local units raise relatively small amounts of funds from their own sources as compared with those at state level. In fact, they are well below the average for the United States. . . . The state raises most of the money."

But the fact remains that local effort for libraries is high; state effort is low.

In applying the per capita support standard of $5.00 and the same fair share formula to one of the proposed multi-parish regional systems in Louisiana, the result might show different proportionate levels of effort. It should be noted that the two decisions on per capita and fair share, arbitrary, perhaps, are necessary for determining the total dollar amount needed for the system and the shares of the three levels of government.

Three factors are generally used in allocating costs to each jurisdictional participant or parish in the system. These are population, income or buying power, and assessed valuation of property.

Table I illustrates this method of determining the share of a parish participant in a public library system.

TABLE I

THE WXYZ SYSTEM

$5.00 per capita
$840,000 budget

Parish	Pop.	Income M	Assessed Value of Property M	% Share of Budget	Total Budget	Local Share	State Share	Federal Share
W	122,000 (73%)	$300 (81%)	$180 (75%)	75.5	$634,200	$380,520	$158,550	$ 95,130
X	16,000 (9%)	25 (7%)	28 (12%)	9.25	77,700	46,620	19,425	11,655
Y	20,000 (12%)	30 (8%)	20 (8%)	10	84,000	50,400	21,000	12,600
Z	10,000 (6%)	16 (4%)	12 (5%)	5.25	44,100	26,460	11,025	6,615
Total	168,000	$371 M	$240 M	100	$840,000	$504,000	$210,000	$126,000

Let us assume that the major resources for this system are in Parish W and that the current local operating expenses for all public libraries in Parish W totals only $247,338. This is 65 per cent of the recommended standard. A policy decision might be made to require the Parishes of X, Y and Z to reach or exceed the level of support set by W. All shares would then be reduced accordingly, and hopefully, Parish W would be a good pacesetter for the system. Such a policy, and all policies governing the pattern for distributing state and federal grants-in-aid to systems, should be tested in terms of the geographic boundaries of the proposed system, population distribution, ability to pay, existing strength of resources (facilities, materials and professional personnel), and other factors peculiar to the state of Louisiana--growth projection, precedents, and so forth.

A new and important consideration in state and local fiscal planning should not be overlooked. There is considerable evidence that the Councils on Government, strongly supported with federal funds under the planning provision of the Demonstration Cities and Urban Development Act, will become a strong influence in shaping the intergovernmental patterns of the future. Of equal importance at this time are the potential implications for library systems development of the Intergovernmental Cooperation's Act of 1968. The chief purpose of this act is "to achieve the fullest cooperation and coordination among the levels of government." This is precisely what will be needed if library systems are established and maintained by all levels of government.

It should be mentioned that the most common approach to funding multi-jurisdictional public library systems is building a budget by identifying the cost items, usually by using the unit costs set forth by the American Library Association or some adaption thereof.[20] The total amount of the budget is then prorated on some basis--population, possibly, or a combination of population and ability to pay--or some other agreed upon method.

In planning a Library Service Center for four suburban Maryland County Library Systems in 1968, Kenneth Duchac proposed volume of business performed as the basis for proration of costs, either by percentage of volumes processed or on a percentage of both volumes processed and titles ordered, using a median percentage figure.[21] This method of cost allocation was recommended for the first year of operation with the understanding that proration should be based on statistical evidence and cost figures determined in the course of the operation of the center.

Louisiana has the legal provision for joint exercise of power in its Local Services Law (R.S. 33:1321-1332), and the Louisiana State Library has interpreted it in terms of joint library operations. Under this law, special responsibilities have been placed on the parties of the agreement in that the use of the law should be aimed at "greater economy and efficiency in the operation and extension of services." It may be a complete range of library services on a multi-jurisdictional basis or a part of the range, but in either case, economy and efficiency should be an important consideration. The law suggests contractual agreement and also that before and after data will be needed.

Let us go back to the principle of library financing which requires remuneration for services rendered by resource centers. In developing the proposed statewide plan in Louisiana, it will be necessary to develop a price structure unless it is determined that a reciprocal policy will suffice.

In a price structure, unit costs are determined on the basis of a detailed analysis of the services rendered in terms of operating costs. This may or may not be a job for a librarian, depending upon how well qualified the librarian is to conduct and interpret work in time observations, desk audits, flow processing charts, etc. The question relating to direct and indirect costs and forecasting future demands should be considered. This is the work of management analysts, and most librarians who see the value of it are quite willing to leave it to the experts.

Summary

By way of summary, I will simply reiterate the major points I have tried to make. The principle of sharing library resources requires new attention to the problems in sharing revenues. Librarians, by and large, are not educated nor oriented in the field of managerial cost accounting which is being required in an increasing number of states and municipalities. The future of library development may be determined on the basis of how well librarians can fit library service into modern society and justify its existence in more scientific terms.

The library profession has adopted a set of sound principles on funding, some of which precede the recent national emphasis on intergovernmental relations and efficiency in the administration of public funds. However, librarians, by and large, have not demonstrated great managerial ability. But, today, considerable effort is being made and research is underway to effect improvements in this critical area of library development.

And, lastly, Louisiana is firmly on the track of statewide library planning in every sense of the term. The nation has recognized the progress made in public library development. It is reasonable to expect the same high level of progress in achieving a statewide system of interlibrary cooperation.

Notes

[1] Orin F. Nolting, Mobilizing Total Library Resources for Effective Service (American Library Association, 1969).

[2] Hannis S. Smith, "A Seamless Web; the Systems Approach to Library Service," ALA Bulletin, February 1967, pp. 180-85.

[3] Maryann Duggan, "Library Network Analysis and Planning (Lib-Nat)," ALA Journal of Library Automation, Sept. 1969, pp. 157-175.

[4] Library Services for the Nation's Needs: Toward Fulfillment of a National Policy, A report of the National Advisory Commission on Libraries, ALA Bulletin, January 1969, pp. 68-94.

[5] John A. Humphry and James Humphry III, Library Service in Louisiana; Keeping Pace with Progress in the State (Louisiana State Library, 1968).

[6] An Overview of the Library Services and Construction Act--Title I, Final Report, by System Development Corporation, Santa Monica, Calif. (Contract No. OEC-0-8-089027-4475(095), March 1969, 373 p.; Public Library Systems in the United States; a Survey of Multi-jurisdictional Systems, by Nelson Associates for the Public Library Association (American Library Assn., 1969), 367p.

[7] A Public Library Program for the State of North Carolina; Report to the North Carolina State Library Board (Arthur D. Little, Inc., n.d.), 32p.; Joseph Becker and Robert M. Hayes, A Proposed Library Network for Washington State (Washington State Library, September 1967), 50p.; A Public Library Program for the Commonwealth of Virginia; A Report to the Virginia State Library Board (Arthur D. Little, Inc., Oct. 1968), 41p.; Harold Goldstein, A Study of Public Library Services in Kansas (Topeka: Kansas State Library, 1968), 92p.; Library Service for All Alaskans; A Statewide Library Development Plan (Chicago Public Administration Service, 1969), 112p.

[8] Standards for Library Functions at the State Level, Revision of the 1963 edition (unpublished), and Minimum Standards for Public Library Systems, 1966 (American Library Assn., 1967).

[9] Intrex, A Report of a Planning Conference on Information Transfer Experiments, 1965, edited by Carl F. J. Overhage and R. Joyce Harman (Mass. Inst. of Technology, c1965), 276p.

[10] EDUNET; A Report of the Summer Study on Information Networks, Conducted by The Inter-University Communications Council (EDUCOM), by George M. Brown, James G. Miller and Thomas A. Keenan (Wiley & Sons, c1965 by EDUCOM), 440p.

[11] Automation and the Library of Congress, A Survey sponsored by the Council on Library Resources, Inc. (U.S. Library of Congress, 1963); Libraries and Automation, Proceedings of the Conference on Libraries and Automation held at Airlie House, May 1963, under the sponsorship of the Library of Congress, National Science Foundation and Council on Library Resources, Inc. (U.S. Library of Congress, 1964), 268p.

[12] Research Methods in Librarianship: Measurement and Evaluation. Papers presented at a conference conducted by the University of Illinois, Sept. 1967, edited by Herbert Goldhar.

[13] On the Economics of Library Operation, A Final Report, submitted to the National Advisory Commission on Libraries, Princeton, New Jersey, Mathematica, June 10, 1967, 118p.

[14] John G. Helmkamp, "Managerial Cost Accounting for a Technical Information Center," American Documentation, April 1969, pp. 111-18.

[15] B. B. Lyle, "Economic Analysis of the Industrial Information Service Project," in Annual Report, 1968-69, IIS, Southern Methodist University, Dallas, Texas.

[16] S. Janice Kee, "State Aid to Public Libraries," *Library Trends*, July 1960.

[17] C. B. Joeckel, Amy Winslow and Lowell Marlin, *A National Plan for Public Library Service* (American Library Assn., 1948).

[18] Hannis S. Smith, "Financing Rural Public Library Systems," in *The Impact of the Library Services Act: Progress and Potential*, Allerton Park, Nov. 5-8, 1961 (Champaign: Illini Union Bookstore), pp. 62-78.

[19] *Emerging Library Systems*; the 1963-66 Evaluation of the New York State Public Library Systems (New York State Education Dept., 1967).

[20] *Costs of Public Library Services: 1968*, a supplement of minimum standards for public library systems, 1966 (American Library Assn., 1968).

[21] Kenneth F. Duchac, *A Library Service Center for Suburban Maryland County Library Systems* (Anne Arundel, Baltimore, Montgomery, Prince George's); An Establishment Proposal (Baltimore, 1968), 42p.

A LOUISIANA LIBRARY SYSTEM:
FOCUS ON THE USER

by

Peter Hiatt

My address to you tonight deals with a Louisiana library system and the user's role in such a system. I have several things to say to you about focusing on the library user. Though I know you are not short of materials or ideas by this point of the Institute, I want to add to your burdens. Maybe I can suggest a few ways to broaden your shoulders to carry these additional concepts.

I am also going to suggest that the educational objective is a role common to all types of libraries, and perhaps, right now at this moment in Louisiana and indeed elsewhere, there is a crucial role for libraries to play.

The heart of my talk is centered in Louisiana libraries and continuing education. But, I also want to speak to you about the client, potential client, potential patron, library user or whatever word you wish, versus the library as an institution. Continuing education not just for people but specifically for librarians stands out in my thoughts. And, if you will permit me, I want to give you some charges that I see coming out of your Institute which I feel are important and would like to share with you. But, always, as I speak to you, the real focus is on people.

All libraries share an educational objective, but I prefer to describe the library as a change agent. Today, the term

**Dr. Hiatt is Associate Professor at the Indiana University Graduate Library School and is Public Library Consultant for the Indiana State Library.*

This presentation was prepared by the editor from a transcript of the tape-recorded address. Every effort has been made to present the thoughts and ideas of the speaker as closely as possible.

"change agent" is taking on new tones so perhaps educational objective is a better way of expressing it. A library acting as a change agent, such as the research library which gives the research worker, the scientist or the professor the piece of information that changes his sense of direction, his experiment or the kind of research he is doing, is a library performing as a change agent.

The public library or the school library with the preschool story hour has been acting as a change agent in a tradition that you and I have long accepted--that of introducing the excitement of the world of books to the young child in its formative years.

Therefore, whether we, as librarians, are trying to establish a lifelong reading habit, find a piece of information vital to scientific research, or relate libraries to other agencies providing assistance in coping with or solving social problems, we must understand that the library is really a change agent in the educational sense of the word.

However, understanding alone is not enough. There is a negative side to most positive approaches, and I want to make you aware of some of these concepts now. Jesse Shera, that great name in the library field, has questioned the role of the library in continuing education, or, as he phrases it, the role of the public library in adult education. Mr. Shera has indicated that he feels the library has experienced nothing short of total failure in its role of adult education or continuing education. You may not agree with his ideas. However, I believe if you consider the role of the library historically, Mr. Shera is correct. On the whole, we *have* failed as continuing education agents.

But, my question in relation to such a totally negative concept of our failure is--So What! Maybe we did fail last year, or a hundred years ago, but that does not mean we should continue to fail in the future.

We have also been told by a number of experts--most of whom are not librarians--that we are doing an increasingly poor and ineffective job in terms of supplying information to people. Even our efforts in providing recreational material are criticized. I have been told frequently that recreational reading needs are served better and less expensively by a number of sources other than libraries. We have only to look at the success of the paperback book stands to see there is some merit in such a statement.

These two points alone are harsh and certainly negative, but, let us consider Mr. Shera's concepts concerning the needs for adult continuing education and the necessity for the involvement of libraries in this area. Alongside his vital ideas on the subject are the theories of such outstanding sociologists as Margaret Mead. The sociologists all agree the average person must retool, retread or whatever other term may be used to represent continuing education, in order to maintain himself in his occupation. They only differ on the length of the intervals between the educational programs. Some say every seven years; others, every five years.

But, whatever time span applies to these people who find it necessary to retread educationally speaking, there still remains the same set of questions confronting them. How can they accomplish it? Where can they get the information? Should they enter a formal educational program? Will informal study suffice?

What I am saying to you is that there is a very significant role for libraries--libraries of all types--in what you and I would call continuing education, whether it be formal, informal, self-education or the whole gamut in between.

There are other relevant changes in society today which have vast implications for our libraries, and I would like to explore a few of these quite briefly. Dramatic changes in educational methods is one. The "New Math" and the emphasis on the study of the sciences in the elementary grades are evidence of this. The vast change in mass media with the advent of condensed news in the news magazines and on the spot television coverage also have dramatic implications for libraries.

However, a news magazine or a television broadcast presents only one author's or one spokesman's points of view which usually are objective. But, this can be and is, potentially very dangerous. A library provides just the opposite, for it houses a multitude of opinions on almost any subject authored by an enormous variety of writers. The library is one of the few remaining places where we can select from a host of opinions and spokesmen or authors--what an exciting challenge that is!

Another social change which has taken its place with the more serious ones and which cannot be overlooked from our standpoint is the strivings of the lower class or the disadvantaged, if you prefer. A growing and very real need exists for more citizens to become involved in the decision-making process in relation to this issue. A person needs information to make a decision, and more and more of the population is becoming involved in this decision-making process. Librarians have a responsibility to the public to make such information available. Are we as involved as we could be in providing this type of information?

Now, let us examine some facts about the existing situation in Louisiana. Almost 700,000 people in this state have less than an eighth grade education, according to the last census figures. This number may decrease or increase when the census now underway is released. But, as the old figures are all we have on hand at this point, let us use those tonight.

The experts tell us that adults with less than an eighth grade education cannot really use written words as tools to function academically or, in other words, to manipulate change, such as change in the learning process. Therefore, if this figure of 700,000 is near accurate in 1969, over 40 per cent of the adults in Louisiana are not potential users of the library as libraries are now constituted.

A study being conducted in Indiana by economists has revealed some generalizations which these experts claim apply to other states as well as to Indiana. The one most applicable to this discussion deals with the economics of the lower classes. The Indiana economists' studies have shown that those with lower incomes generally contribute a greater amount of support to public libraries in ratio to those with higher incomes. Yet, the lower classes derive less benefit. This generalization is based on all sorts of reasoning, but primarily, that you do not have to own property to pay taxes.

However, the frightening fact remains that the lower income group is paying a greater percentage of support for libraries than the higher income group, but is deriving considerably less benefit. There is a justification for service to the unreached disadvantaged if you ever needed one.

But, what is the library's role in this miasma of social change?

I think the role is one of exciting importance and activity. As librarians, we need to stimulate awareness to the fact that we have materials to aid people in coping with these tremendous explosions facing us and frequently disconcerting us.

Libraries should become more active in preparing the adult to continue to learn, to grow intellectually, and to take his rightful place in society. This is a part of what education is all about. It is a real part of what libraries are about, whether they are for use by students in elementary schools, high schools, colleges or universities, or for the general public.

But, the means for providing this kind of service are more difficult than establishing the formulas for such. The latest figures I have indicate that Louisiana spends $529.12 to send one child through one year of school. Yet, I understand that you are about to recommend that your University spend only five per cent of its total budget on libraries.

What is the purpose of education? One of the primary purposes surely is to encourage students to learn to use books effectively, and, therefore, use libraries effectively.

Yet, while you spend almost $530 a year to send a child to school in this state, you spend only an average of $115 to give him library service the rest of his life. This figure was reached on the assumption that a person will live 50 years from the date of his school graduation. As your per capita public library support is approximately $2.30, multiplying this figure by 50 years of projected life reveals that only $115 is supposed to provide a person's library needs to continue his education informally *for the rest of his life.* This is about one-fourth the amount spent to send a child through one year of school.

What I am building up to is the fact that if you really intend to meet people's needs for library services and library materials in Louisiana, YOU NEED FUNDS. Our Indiana economists shocked librarians in my state when they told us they really could not understand how libraries can expect to have any impact on anyone when such a small amount of money is spent on these institutions. I believe Louisiana is not too different in this respect from many other states.

I told you earlier I had some charges to make to you, and I am now at the point to charge each segment of you with certain obligations necessary to the successful development of a workable library system in your state.

First, the trustees. You are the ones who have the power for change, not the public librarians. I am not telling you who are public librarians to take a back seat in this developmental period, but only that the primary power to change the public library rests first with the trustees.

Secondly, the Louisiana State Library. Your library has the opportunity to better its nationally respected record for leadership by continuing to follow the same philosophy for library development that you have followed since the 1920's. The philosophy I am referring to is that of anticipating needs and not waiting for the needs to mushroom beyond control before reacting to them.

Those of you who are academic librarians should stimulate more concern about social problems among students and faculty, and, at the same time, show them the need for information available in libraries to lead them to make wise decisions. If this can be accomplished at the academic level, we will not have to be quite so concerned about the next 50 years of leadership.

The library focus should be on the students, and perhaps the academic librarians can help us to recognize this more fully. Additionally, I think we need to turn to the academic librarians in Louisiana to help lower the barriers among all types of libraries for sharing resources.

To the school librarians, I present the charge of encouraging the development of elementary school library service. I think the growth of this type of library where many children for the first time are exposed to books, libraries and library service takes priority. For this reason, I would like to charge all of you, not just the elementary school librarians, with the responsibility of encouraging these libraries' development.

I charge the special librarians with the obligation of sharing with us your service orientation--your clientele-centered knowledge. This is a talent more of us need if we are to succeed in providing superior library service to users.

And, the public librarians. We can no longer remain the quiet place down the street where people can escape from the rest of the world. My charge to you reflects the basic role of our public library concept. That charge or basic role is to help people adjust to and accept change. You as public librarians can accomplish this, and I hope you will strive toward that goal.

Those of you at the Louisiana State University Library School enjoy a fantastic national reputation, and this places considerable responsibilities on your shoulders. But, as the librarians meet and talk, the end result will be that more demands will be placed on your accredited library school. You will receive more requests for your advice and services, and you will probably develop more needs as the libraries in your state move forward. To you, I direct the charge of developing rapidly to meet the new needs and demands which are certain to come your way before those same needs and demands become impossible to control.

Now to my central charge. This charge is not directed to any specific type of library or librarian but to all of you. You have an obligation to be honest--honest as completely and unqualifiedly as possible when moving in the areas of cooperation. You must face the fact that cooperation does not often pay off for *your* library or *my* library. It may cost us more, not only in terms of funds but also services, than we are willing to give.

If we are going to talk about cooperation, we must view it as a special commitment, not an activity or service that can be easily balanced out. Cooperation is a *professional commitment,* almost missionary-like in terms of sacrifices which your library may have to make.

But, cooperation does pay off. It pays off to the library user. And, to the extent you and your colleagues leave this Institute with that commitment toward cooperation, you determine the extent to which the people of Louisiana will benefit from what you have learned. Remember! *It is the people you serve who will be the beneficiaries of your cooperation--not the libraries.*

Finally, how about our need as librarians to retread? You and I have two needs to provide us with change resulting from our continuing education. Those needs can best be described in two words: content and behavior. We need more content or information. We need to know what is happening. We need to learn new things. But much more important, we need the ability to change our behavior if it is necessary. This is what change is all about.

Since the first Institute meeting five days ago, you have accepted some need for change or, possibly, a lot of need for change. But, this has happened to you here where you have had an opportunity to interchange ideas with your colleagues, to sound out theories, and maybe to lower some barriers. I believe if you review the ideas you brought to the Institute in the framework of all the new and exciting concepts introduced to you this week, you will understand how dramatically some of your thinking has changed.

However, now you are about to return to your homes and your libraries to be faced by people who were like you before your Institute experience. Maybe that statement is not entirely true, but you will be faced with many ideas different from those you have today.

Most of the experts outside the library field have the same painful answer to the question: What is the single biggest barrier to library change? LIBRARIANS is their common reply. Not chancellors, not politicians, not the community, but us. But, why did you come this week if not because you were interested in change?

You, in Louisiana, have already recognized a need for change. You have looked over the pattern of library development in your state yourselves. Then, you employed John and James Humphry to provide you with an in-depth survey and a suggested plan of change for statewide library service.

However, the basic change first involves people--you and me. To bring about change requires many things, but I believe communicating with each other tops the list. This is what you have been doing this week--talking and listening.

And, all this input and output of information has been directed toward evolving a professional attempt to direct positive change in order to provide the people of Louisiana with the quality and quantity of library service they deserve.

With this final concept, we have come full circle--from continuing education for people to continuing education for librarians. However, before I close, I want to leave you with one more thought to ponder. I assume you know that elsewhere, we librarians look at Louisiana's long history of parish library service development with envy and with a little bit of professional pride, too. Because of your previous successes in the field we non-Louisianians are watching with anticipation and a good deal of excitement to see what your next stage of library leadership is going to bring in the way of new ideas.

Thank you for allowing me this brief moment of involvement in Louisiana library development.

DESIGNATION OF LIBRARY SYSTEMS

Southeast

Library Center - New Orleans Public Library

Jefferson
Orleans
Plaquemines
St. Bernard
St. Charles
St. James
St. John the Baptist

South Central

Library Center - Lafayette Public Library

Acadia
Evangeline
Iberia
Lafayette
Lafourche
St. Landry
St. Martin
St. Mary
Terrebonne
Vermilion

Northeast

Library Center - Ouachita Parish Public Library

Caldwell
Concordia
East Carroll
Franklin
Jackson
Lincoln
Madison
Morehouse
Ouachita
Richland
Tensas
Union
West Carroll

Central

Library Center - Rapides Parish Library

Avoyelles
Catahoula
Grant
LaSalle
Natchitoches
Rapides
Vernon
Winn

Capital

Library Center - East Baton Rouge Parish Library

Ascension
Assumption
East Baton Rouge
East Feliciana
Iberville
Livingston
Pointe Coupee
St. Helena
St. Tammany
Tangipahoa
Washington
West Baton Rouge
West Feliciana

Southwest

Library Center - Calcasieu Parish Library

Allen
Beauregard
Calcasieu
Cameron
Jefferson Davis

Northwest

Library Center - Shreve Memorial Library

Bienville
Bossier
Caddo
Claiborne
De Soto
Red River
Sabine
Webster

Note: The Louisiana Library Association at its 1969 convention authorized the Sub-Committee on Planning of the Library Development Committee to make a decision on the designation of systems. The Sub-Committee on Planning of LLA approved the above designation on September 5, 1969. This designation is for the purpose of organization of pilot library systems and is also recommended for the development of cooperative projects. It does not, however, commit the libraries to formal participation in a library system. Revisions may be made if adequate justification, based on experience, is submitted to the Louisiana Library Association.

GROUP DISCUSSIONS BY PROPOSED SYSTEMS: STATEMENTS OF PRIORITIES AND RECOMMENDATIONS

As a background for the study groups on "Patterns of Library Development," Miss Genevieve Casey, Program Consultant and Coordinator, prepared five "Questions of Priority" for special consideration. These were:

1. What target group or groups in Louisiana have the greatest need for improved library and information services?
   - a. Students? Professional people? Business and industry? Government workers? Aged? Unaffiliated adults? Disadvantaged?
2. What is the single most important need of the people of Louisiana for library and information services which can be met by coordinated effort?
   - a. Strengthening library resources and services in the several regions of the state?
   - b. Improving access to the reference and research resources in the major libraries of the state, through local libraries of all types?
   - c. Other?
3. On the basis of answers to 1 and 2 what activities have priority?
   - a. Strengthening local libraries of all types by means of regional systems which may provide the following services: cooperative acquisition and organization of materials, shared personnel and in-service education, area-wide cards to all types of libraries regardless of geographic and other institution boundaries.
   - b. Strengthening major metropolitan public libraries to enable improved service to the total region, both by interloan and consultant services to local public libraries and direct service to all residents of the area.
   - c. Establishing access offices in the major research libraries of the state and the extension of WATS and TWX communications.
   - d. Statewide acquisition, cataloging, processing center for all types of libraries.
   - e. Other

4. What are the implications for organization of the above decisions to be recommended to the Louisiana Library Association and the Louisiana State Library?
   a. Continued regional planning.
   b. A committee of the administrators of research libraries to plan for coordinated acquisitions.
   c. A committee representative of all types of libraries to plan a cooperative cataloging-processing center.
   d. Establishment of access offices.
   e. Establishment of a regional pilot system.
   f. A committee on the state's personnel and in-service education needs with representatives of library education, the Louisiana State Library and all types of libraries.
   g. Other

5. Implication of the above decisions for financing.

Each of the study groups representing the proposed systems considered the preceding questions and filed reports of the discussion groups with the Institute Director. The following statements incorporate summaries and selected excerpts from the reports with delineations of area priorities and recommendations.*

Proposed Northeast System

Prior to the Louisiana State University Library School Institute on the Concept of Systems of Libraries with Special Application to Louisiana, the librarians in this proposed system had prepared a proposal to secure funds for a pilot system project from the Louisiana State Library.

Following Miss Casey's recommendations the group concentrated on examining the background of users with emphasis on education, various economic and social factors, business, industry and agriculture.

---

*For further information included in the study group reports see: Shirley K. Stephenson, "Highlights of the Institute on the Concept of Systems of Libraries with Special Application to Louisiana," LLA Bulletin, Winter 1970.

In establishing priorities, the participants concluded: *The greatest need is to strengthen the resources of all our libraries for optimal service to adult students of all levels engaged in both formal and informal education.* This is the target group.

Since patrons usually will not drive more than 20 miles to obtain library service, the local collection must be strengthened. As there are no major metropolitan libraries in Louisiana, it is all the more necessary to improve the local parish libraries and resources. This involves more books and a better qualified staff.

The first priority is to enlist a better qualified staff. Salaries are low, and librarians frequently will not continue in their positions unless they are long-time or hometown residents. The parish library administrators do not have time to probe the needs of patrons because of the demands of administration, even though they are the best qualified members of their staffs to assist their patrons.

Therefore, the single most important need is *a regular, step by step, significant improvement and strengthening of the financial base support of libraries which will enable the library profession to hire and keep highly qualified personnel at all levels and to upgrade library collections applicable to our stated target group.*

Priority activities include the planning and establishment of a regional system of libraries which will provide for the strengthening of local libraries as well as the system center through grants to member libraries. Suggested services of the regional system are cooperative acquisitions planning, area-wide access to all member libraries and interlibrary loan and reference referral services.

It is recommended that the Louisiana State Library Processing Center extend its services to all public library members. Further development of rapid communications and delivery service was suggested along with the initiation of an effective public relations program and the establishment of a union catalog of system library holdings.

The proposed recommendations to the Louisiana Library Association and the Louisiana State Library with projected financial implications follow:

1. Establishment of a regional pilot system.
2. Continued regional planning and cooperation among libraries of other designated system regions.
3. Establishment of a committee on the state's personnel and in-service education needs with representatives of library education, the Louisiana State Library and all types of libraries participating.
4. An annual grant from the Louisiana State Library to finance the operation of the Northeast Louisiana Library System libraries will be sought in the amount of $161,515.
5. Member public libraries will make an effort to reach the standard $2.00 per capita support as outlined in the conditions for qualifying for a pilot system.
6. A concerted, intensive, extensive and coordinated public relations program to enlist political and public support for the improvement of statewide library financial resources is recommended.

The recorder, an academic librarian, added that since the pilot system has been described as a time and opportunity for experimentation, he will speak to his colleagues in the other academic libraries in the region concerning experimenting with open door, walk-in check-out service to anyone having a system library card. Should this be agreeable, the experiment will be conducted in order to give the systems concept every possible advantage during the two-year trial period.

Proposed Northwest System

This discussion group outlined the following statement of priority:

Since libraries in this area serve elementary and secondary schools, colleges and individuals in certain industries and in military service, it appears that the public library should gear its needs to the general public and the business community. The *needs of the library patrons in this region can best be served by increasing and updating the general collections in each local library.*

Priority is to be given to the following activities:

1. Building specialized collections, where feasible, through a planned acquisitions program which would enrich the overall system collection.
2. The services of personnel with specialized training or competencies will be made available to all the libraries in the area.
3. The development of a plan for adding additional personnel to provide area-wide service.
4. The development of an in-service training program to meet the needs of the libraries.
5. The development of a cooperative plan involving the use of a system-wide borrower's card.
6. The planning of an organized interlibrary loan program to provide access to unavailable materials.
7. The development of a plan for rapid interlibrary communication.
8. Involvement in the support of a plan of statewide service in acquisition, cataloging and processing for public libraries, with the idea that other types of libraries eventually may participate in these services.
9. Study existing facilities for rapid delivery of materials.

To implement the above proposals, this group recommends that the Louisiana Library Association and Louisiana State Library consider the following:

1. Continue regional planning including consideration of the possibility of rezoning some areas.
2. Establish a regional pilot system.
3. Name a committee including representatives of library education, the Louisiana State Library and all types of libraries to consider the state's personnel and in-service needs.

The group concluded that with a $5.00 per capita basis for the program, increased state, local and federal funds would be required to accomplish the suggested goals. This region's librarians pointed out that *they looked to the Louisiana State Library* *for leadership in securing state and federal funds while they would resume responsibility for securing funds at the local level.*

Proposed Southeast System

It was generally agreed in this discussion group, that *the single most important need for the state is in improving access to the reference and research resources already in the various regions.* The participants stated this could be achieved by:

1. Making both patrons and librarians aware of the wealth of reference tools and research resources existing in their region.
2. Encouraging their use by improving access to them through better communications.
3. The relaxing of restrictions on their use.

Cooperative acquisitions could be expected to follow as a by-product of this exchange of information, thus enhancing the value of existing collections.

The Southeast region accorded top priority to the establishment of a cooperative referral center to be housed in the New Orleans Public Library. This proposed center would be staffed by qualified reference personnel with adequate support from such rapid communications devices as TWX, WATS, etc., along with a delivery service to provide rapid exchange of available materials.

It was agreed work would proceed toward preparation of an application to the Louisiana State Library for support of a cooperative referral center.

The group recommended that the Louisiana Library Association and the Louisiana State Library continue their studies of regional and statewide planning with special consideration to be given to the development of uniform procedures, forms and equipment for all the proposed systems.

Proposed Capital System

The Capital discussion group agreed it would be necessary to conduct a more thorough study of the population before attempting to designate any one group of users as having the greatest need for improved library service.

Greater strengthening of local collections was believed to be of prime importance. Additionally, it was agreed that improved library service could be brought about by in-service training and through the use of area-wide borrower's cards.

The Capital area librarians favored the centralized purchasing and processing services of the Louisiana State Library and urged the continuation and the expansion of these services. Furthermore, they encouraged the extension of WATS and TWX communications devices in order to provide better access to resource materials.

Though evidence pointed up the need for cooperative efforts in the region in order to provide improved library service, the group did not reach a decision as to the best method for achieving this. However, they did encourage a continuation of regional planning and endorsed a committee to study the state's personnel and in-service education needs with representatives of library education, the Louisiana State Library and all types of libraries participating.

The librarians agreed to withhold recommendations for funding until further study of regional planning could be conducted. They did pledge, however, to support the Louisiana State Library and the Louisiana Library Association in their efforts to investigate possible sources of revenue for financing cooperative efforts.

Short-term goals included making a demographic survey to obtain a population profile of the region and the establishment of priority needs. Long-range goals consisted of making an in depth study of the implications of regional cooperation and also studying the state's film resources and re-examining the lending policy in terms of user needs.

Proposed Central System

Relative to the list of patron priorities and pursuant to the goal of expanded library services through cooperative efforts, this discussion group submitted the following proposals:

1. That we, as members of the proposed Central Library System, work within the regional boundaries as suggested by the Subcommittee on Planning and Implementation of the Louisiana Library Association.
2. That the librarians from all types of libraries hold meetings quarterly at the various libraries to better acquaint each other with the facilities and resources of the member libraries, and to establish the mechanical means for the implementation of suggested cooperative ventures.
3. That we consider the creation of a union list of periodicals held by member libraries with a view toward later involvement with similar lists in the other systems.
4. That we attempt to coordinate our reference and research services by fully exploring our own resources before utilizing resources outside our system boundaries.
5. That we provide cooperative in-service training, cooperative public relations and cooperative assistance and guidance in patron services through workshops and other related programs.
6. That we make accessible to each library in the system the materials, information and resources of all libraries to the fullest extent allowed by financial considerations.
7. That we strengthen existing channels of communication among all types of libraries utilizing the various rapid communication devices available.

The group considered the preceding proposals to be short-range goals. The following propositions were listed as long-term goals:

1. That we move toward compatibility in circulation systems in order to be able to offer system-wide borrowing privileges eventually. A first step in reaching this goal would be to coordinate the charging techniques in each library.
2. That we endorse the existing centralized cataloging, classification and processing center now being conducted by the Louisiana State Library, and that we agree to work toward a statewide processing center for all libraries.

Proposed South Central System

The South Central group determined the following needs, not necessarily in order of importance:

1. Rapid information service.
2. Better reference service.
3. Union catalog of holdings.
4. Better service to students, business and industrial patrons as well as to the culturally and economically disadvantaged.
5. Centralized processing and cataloging.
6. More readers' advisory service.
7. More professional personnel.
8. Subject specialty collections.

This group recognized that centralized processing and cataloging on the state level is much needed now and will become essential in time for all public libraries. However, they agreed that academic and special libraries must make their own decisions as to the feasibility of participating in such a project.

The routine use of TWX for requests which cannot be served in the system was recommended along with an access office to coordinate system services.

In discussing the outline of questions of priority, the group thought that no one target group could be cited as needing greater attention than another, with the possible exception of students. It was also noted that this region has no research libraries and is primarily public library oriented.

The group cited the most important need in the area as one of *improving access to the reference and research resources in the major libraries of the state through the local libraries.* They pledged to initiate the following programs in attaining this goal.

1. The development of a union list of serials held in all types of libraries.
2. To provide a union shelf list of public library adult nonfiction holdings.

3. To purchase uniform bibliographic tools for each library in the system in order to better use the major collections of the state.

These librarians encouraged the sharing of personnel and urged an increase in availability of in-service educational programs.

The libraries in this area now participate in a reciprocal borrowing plan among public libraries though an area-wide card is not presently used. They suggested this program be considered in the other systems in the state.

No formula for funding was proposed. Instead, the group considered the possibility of a study of cooperative financing in their area to determine whether this type of funding would be feasible.

The group agreed to work cooperatively on those projects which could be conducted with existing funds in order to begin striving toward goals which would eventually require a broader financial basis.

Proposed Southwest System

The Southwest discussion group proposed to undertake improvement of library services in their area by first utilizing the resources already available in their locale. They plan to further broaden their cooperative ventures in such projected activities as:

1. Purchase of supplies.
2. In-service education.
3. Public information service.
4. Media services.
5. Use of compatible forms in cooperative activities.

The group considered a cooperative acquisitions program which would permit each library to specialize in a particular area thereby avoiding unnecessary duplication in this specialty. They planned to examine their various strengths by exchanging lists of special holdings as their first step toward the realization of this program.

An immediate need and also a long-range goal was defined as the *addition of staff at the local, regional and state level in all libraries* including the provision for personnel with special talents and training.

Among the activities to be explored as to their possibility and immediacy were:

1. An improved communications system between the libraries in the area.
2. Rapid delivery service from one library to another.
3. Use of compatible equipment.
4. Use of open door borrowers' cards.
5. Employment of a person to maintain a liaison with the resources available in the area.

This group anticipated a statewide cataloging service for all libraries along with a processing center at the regional level.

The Southwest group planned to continue regional planning and cooperation extending these to include representatives from all types of libraries. Periodic meetings will be held to evaluate the progress.

In the area of finances, the group agreed that *the most obvious gap was in the area of state funding.* They look forward to concerted action being taken to increase state financing for the benefit of local libraries through equalization and through strengthening the support received from the Louisiana State Library. These librarians concluded that through sharing responsibilities and financing, a greater return for the taxpayer could be achieved for his tax dollar investment.

REPORTS FROM TYPE OF LIBRARY STUDY GROUPS: PUBLIC, SCHOOL OR MEDIA CENTER, ACADEMIC, SPECIAL AND STATE

Public Libraries

The group considered the importance of identifying the user, the public library's responsibility to the user, and its ultimate purpose in enriching the total library program in relation to determining the role of the public library in an interlibrary system. *It was generally agreed that the role should be one of providing leadership in the system in as much as the public library reaches all library users.*

The following specific objectives in a system were defined as:

1. Access to material through interlibrary loan.
2. Access through reciprocal borrowing privileges.
3. Improved access via rapid communications.
4. The development of a central library processing and purchasing agency.
5. Cooperative publicity programs.
6. Identification of special collections and acquisitions.
7. The strengthening of the resource center as well as the member libraries.

It was recognized that the functions of a pilot program would be to test the feasibility of the regional system in Louisiana and to experiment with types of services and organization. The group agreed that *any pilot system must be designed to fit the region in which it is located.* However, it was generally agreed that the services and methods tested should provide some guidelines applicable to other regions throughout the state.

Suggestions for immediate cooperation by libraries outside the pilot region included:

1. The development of acquisitions policies to avoid needless duplication of materials.

2. Exploring the possibility of developing compatible forms and equipment for use throughout the region.

School Libraries or Media Centers

This group defined needs and/or limitations of school library programs in the following areas:

1. Staff.
2. Facilities in service programs.
3. Better communication among librarians, particularly public librarians and teachers.
4. Lack of parish-wide supervision in many areas of the state.
5. Time schedules which curtail or prohibit students' use of the library.
6. Failure of the librarian to see the real role in the main stream of education.
7. Need for providing information to parents.
8. More effective communication with school administrators.

These librarians considered *the question of whether school libraries could participate in a system of libraries.* However, the group agreed to cooperate in whatever could be accomplished.

They suggested one avenue of cooperation could be accomplished by the employment of a liaison librarian with school library specialization at the regional level who could work effectively with school and public libraries in coordinating the programs and resources available from both agencies for material benefit.

Academic Libraries

This group felt there was considerable cooperation or good will especially within adjacent areas but *not necessarily as mapped out by the "Humphry System."*

They cited the principal obstructions to more cooperative activities as being a lack of communication and a general unawareness of the resources already available in each area.

The academic librarians did not consider the current strength of the Louisiana State Library as an "unmixed blessing" because they felt it encouraged the smaller parish librarians to rely excessively upon the State Library. They agreed that the parish libraries should exhaust the resources in their own regions before turning to the State Library. They pointed to the example of the layering of systems where regional resources are utilized whenever possible, and the State Library resource centers are only approached when all else fails. It was agreed that such an approach would tend to relieve the excessive burden now imposed upon a few major libraries.

There is a general willingness among this group to render complete services to all patrons, but, at the same time, there is also a strong desire among academic librarians to protect their holdings because they are national assets in many cases and need to be preserved. Because of these conflicting attitudes, the group agreed difficulties in this area revolved around the open door policy, interlibrary loan, lack of funds to support quality service, and payment to academic and private libraries for services rendered to the public.

Specific recommendations from these librarians follow:

1. In order to remedy the communications gap, academic librarians need:
   a. union lists of serials and union lists of monographs,
   b. improved communications facilities including long distance telephone budgets, TWX, and messenger service within regions and ultimately within states.
2. A system is needed to provide the most immediate sources in the area for librarians.
3. A cost or charge should be initiated for all users of interlibrary loans to create an appreciation for this type service.
4. The State Library in cooperation with special and academic libraries should come to some mutual understanding which will respect the needs of all patrons.

This group concluded by pointing out that considerable strengthening of Louisiana State Library resources in heavily used areas might appreciably cut down demands for academic library support.

Special Libraries

These librarians first emphasized that their libraries were all located in either the Capital or the Southeast systems, and that they were heavily made up of hospital and medical libraries. In this frame of reference, they formulated the following recommendations:

1. Due to the diversity and variety of special libraries, certain standards should be established to determine eligibility in the system.
2. A committee of special librarians should evaluate collections to determine their suitability as resource collections.
3. Agreement was reached to cooperate to the extent permitted by their governing institutions or management policies.
4. The collections will be made accessible to serious researchers. However, due to the character of reference work in special libraries, unlimited search questions could not be undertaken from libraries outside the agency.
5. Special libraries within a system will act as resource centers for their area of responsibility.
6. Where subject areas overlap in these and other libraries, we will be willing to take the initiative in cooperative acquisitions.
7. All participating special libraries should receive a copy of any union or book catalog compiled by the system.
8. Participating special libraries with compatible subject specialties will exchange current acquisition lists.

Louisiana State Library

The report presented by the Louisiana State Library study group in relation to this library's role in systems development and statewide library development follows:

Structure and Government of Library Service

1. The State Library should adopt and carry out a role of leadership that permits maintenance of an overall view of library functions within that state.

2. The State Library should constantly study and review federal and state laws affecting library service.

3. The State Library should in its leadership role provide necessary funding for the development of statewide plans for all types of library services, for interlibrary cooperation, for research, and for demonstration and experimental programs that will lead to improved library service to all the people of the state. The State Library should work toward securing additional state funds for the attainment of quality library service.

4. The State Library should provide regular and frequent advisory and consultant services to librarians, board members, government officials, friends of the library groups, and others interested in library development and improvement.

5. The State Library should continue to gather and publish annual statistics on the libraries in the state, academic and public, and should gather and publish annual statistics on special and institutional libraries.

6. The State Library should disseminate, on a regular basis, information relating to the present condition of library development in the state, to effective practices and programs, and to statewide plans. In cooperation with the Louisiana Library Association, the State Library is responsible for interpreting library service to the government and to the public, and for promoting a climate of public opinion favorable to library development.

7. The State Library should promote, stimulate and provide, as appropriate, a regular program of in-service training and continuing education for librarians, library staffs, trustees and others concerned with library development and interlibrary cooperation. This should be done in cooperation with the Louisiana State University Library School, and those institutions offering undergraduate library courses, and other appropriate agencies.

8. It is the responsibility of the State Library to initiate and encourage research, and to evaluate the effectiveness of library service on a regular, frequent schedule.

9. The State Library should encourage and facilitate cooperative library services across state lines through interstate library compacts, contractual agreements, and other established cooperative endeavors.

10. The State Library should exert leadership to utilize modern technology to extend and facilitate bibliographical access within the state and across political borders.
11. A clear and continuing official relationship should exist between the State Library and officials with responsibility for the libraries which the state maintains for its health, welfare and correctional programs.

Library Materials

1. The State Library should encourage the development of a comprehensive long-range plan for developing, coordinating, maintaining and improving the total library resources in the state.
2. The State Library should develop its collection to fill requests of a more advanced nature. It should not duplicate, however, the resources of already existing facilities, especially where these are not used to capacity or where they are too specialized and too expensive to warrant duplication.
3. The State Library should continue to maintain and develop its film collection as a supplementary resource for public libraries.
4. The State Library should carefully evaluate the use of its recordings collection to determine if this service should be continued.
5. The State Library should continue to provide a wide range of reading materials for the blind and physically handicapped.
6. The State Library should continue the State Library Processing Center with regular evaluations of its effectiveness and consideration of its expansion.
7. The State Library should continue the Rapid Communications Network with periodic evaluation of its effectiveness and plan for its expansion.

Personnel

1. The State Library should have personnel adequate to provide the leadership, general guidance, planning and specialized information service needed at the state level.

2. The State Library has the responsibility for helping to develop adequate library personnel resources in the state by means of recruitment to the profession, in cooperation with LLA, including the provision of placement services to libraries and librarians and full utilization of human resources.

Note: The above statements, though frequently localized, were drawn from the *Minimum Standards for Public Library Systems, 1966* (ALA, 1967), and the *Standards for Library Functions at the State Level: Revision of the 1963 Edition* (ALA, not yet published).

IMPLICATIONS OF THE INSTITUTE FOR STATEWIDE LIBRARY DEVELOPMENT

Each of the Institute study groups proposed definite plans for action as outlined in the preceding group reports. All groups established future meeting dates to determine means for carrying out the programs of improved library service which had been determined during the week-long meetings. Several of these groups have already met and are seriously involved in working out their roles in cooperative activities. The others are expected to meet in the near future.

As the groups representing the proposed systems and types of libraries have continued functioning in this area since the Institute, so have the Louisiana State Library and the Louisiana Library Association. Miss Sallie Farrell, Louisiana State Librarian, has identified several activities which the Louisiana State Library and the state association are considering developing in order to strengthen statewide library service. These follow:

1. The need for improved communications within the profession.

   The Library Communique, issued irregularly by the Louisiana State Library, can carry reports on regional planning in addition to other developments throughout the state.

2. The need for a coordinated public information program.

   The chairman of the Library Development Committee of the Louisiana Subcommittee on Planning has been authorized to appoint a committee to develop specific plans to be presented to the subcommittee as a whole.

3. Union list of serials.

   The identification of the need for regional lists by almost every region emphasized the importance of proceeding carefully and slowly, assuring compatibility of all efforts. The Louisiana Library Association president's suggestion that a guidance committee be appointed has been noted.

4. Personnel.

The need for more Louisiana State Library consultants, particularly consultants who are specialists, along with the need for additional LSU Library School faculty to train more students to fill additional positions have been noted. The need for in-service training for professional as well as clerical staff in cooperation with the LSU Library School and other institutions offering undergraduate library courses has also been recognized. The Louisiana State Library and the Louisiana Library Association have named a committee to study personnel needs and utilization.

5. Library studies and research.

The State Library should be more concerned with its responsibility to initiate and encourage research and to evaluate services.

6. Continuation of the Rapid Communications Network with periodic evaluation of its effectiveness and plans for its expansion.

7. Continuation of the Processing Center with consideration of its expansion.

8. The need to investigate various patterns of financing total library service.

The need for a broadly representative study committee of librarians, officials and lay citizens was clearly indicated. The Library Development Committee of Louisiana Subcommittee on Planning authorized its chairman to appoint such a committee.

In conclusion, it is evident that the Institute contributed momentum to a plan for statewide library development. It is hoped this momentum will continue toward achieving the goal of providing total library service to all the residents of Louisiana.

INSTITUTE PRIMARY SOURCES

Humphry, John A., and James Humphry III. Library Services in Louisiana. New York, 1968.

LLA Bulletin, volume 32, number 1.

Nelson Associates. Public Library Systems in the United States. Chicago: American Library Association, 1969.

Public Libraries in Louisiana, Statistics of Use, 1968. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State Library, 1969.

INSTITUTE PERSONNEL

ADMINISTRATIVE STAFF

Institute Director--Dr. Shirley K. Stephenson, Professor of Library Science, Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge, Louisiana.

B.A., Tulane University
B.S., M.A., Ph.D., Louisiana State University

Experience includes secondary school teaching and school library experience at both the building and systems level, New Orleans Public Library experience, and state level experience both in Mississippi and in Louisiana. Has served on the faculty at Louisiana State University since 1943. Teaching responsibility includes, among others, the course in County and Regional Libraries. Contributor to library journals.

Associate Director--Miss Vivian Cazayoux, Library Consultant, Louisiana State Library.

B.A., B.S. in Library Science, Louisiana State University
Advanced Study, Library School, University of Wisconsin

Experience includes parish (i.e., county) library administration, and, at the Louisiana State Library, responsibility for films and recordings and service to state institutions in addition to her present position. Is presently chairman of the Louisiana Library Association Committee for the Study of the Humphry report.

Administrative Assistant--Mrs. Jane P. Kleiner, Interlibrary Loan Librarian, Louisiana State University Library.

B.A. in Journalism, M.S. in Library Science, Louisiana State University

Experience includes newspaper reporting and public relations in Baton Rouge. At the Louisiana State University Library, has served as head Circulation Librarian, Assistant Documents Librarian prior to assuming her present position. Is active in interlibrary cooperation projects and committees in the state. Contributor to library journals.

CLERICAL STAFF

Mrs. Pat Hicks, Institute Secretary

Mrs. Norma Martin, Louisiana State University Library School Graduate Assistant

Miss Lunell Bourque, Louisiana State University Library School Student Assistant

CONSULTANTS AND SPEAKERS

Miss Genevieve Casey--Associate Professor, Department of Library Science, Wayne State University. Program Consultant and Coordinator.

B.A. in Library Science, College of St. Catherine
B.A. in Journalism, University of Minnesota
M.A., Library School, University of Michigan

Experience includes public library (Detroit Public Library) and Army library service prior to her appointment as State Librarian, Michigan State Library. Has responsibility at Wayne State University for workshops and institutes.

Mr. Charles Nelson--Principal of Peat, Marwick, Mitchell and Company and formerly president of Nelson Associates.

A.B., St. John's College, Annapolis

Experience as a specialist in management consulting; author of numerous works including library slides and surveys, specialization in educational activities; author of Developing Responsible Public Leaders, Quantity and Quality in Higher Education, a nationwide survey for the American Library Association entitled Public Library Systems in the United States, ALA 1969.

Dr. Peter Hiatt--Associate Professor, Library School, Indiana University.

B.A., Colgate
M.A. in Library Science, Ph.D., Rutgers University

Experience in the Elizabeth, N.J., Public Library and as a Public Library Consultant, Indiana State Library. Has directed workshops, and is presently surveying, with others, continuing education programs in the Midwest.

Mrs. Catherine S. Chadwick--Administrative Librarian, Black Gold Cooperative Library System and Director, Ventura County and City Library, Ventura, California.

B.A. in French, University of Puget Sound
B.A., University of California at Berkeley
Graduate Certificate, University of California, Berkeley

Experience in school and public library development, consultant and advisory work in Washington, Montana and California; extension library service in Arizona Department of Archives; and Director of Library Service, Montana State Library, prior to assuming the position of Director of the Ventura County and City Library and Administrative Librarian of the Black Gold Cooperative Library System.

Dr. Stephen A. McCarthy--Executive Director of the Association of Research Libraries, Washington, D.C.

A.B. and M.A., Gonzaga University, Spokane, Washington
B.L.S., McGill University
Ph.D., University of Chicago

Experience includes a wide range of professional experiences in teaching, library service consulting, writing, and library administrations. Dr. McCarthy served as Assistant Librarian and Cataloger at St. John's University, Minnesota; Reference Assistant, Chicago American University; Librarian of University College, Northwestern University; Director of University of Nebraska Library, and Director of Cornell University Library System prior to assuming his present position.

Miss Isobel P. Lynch--Education Supervisor, Division of Library Extension, Maryland State Department of Education with responsibilities including coordination of school and public library programs and services.

A.B., Goucher College
B.L.S., Columbia University
Post-graduate study in Public Administration, Johns Hopkins University

Experience as Branch Assistant at Enoch Pratt Free Library; Army Post library service in Japan, Command Librarian for Army European theater, World War II; Head of Adult Department, Kanawha County Public Library, Charleston, W. Virginia; Assistant Director and Chief of Extension Division of the Enoch Pratt Free Library, prior to assuming her present position.

Miss S. Janice Kee--Library Services Program Officer, Bureau of Adult Vocational and Library Programs, U.S. Office of Education Region VII, Dallas, Texas.

B.S. in English and Education, Texas Wesleyan College
M.L.S., Texas Woman's University

Experience in teaching and school library service, library education, Army library service, library consultant and statewide library development. Positions include Executive Secretary of ALA Public Library Division, Extension Librarian for Missouri State Library, Secretary of Wisconsin Free Library Commission, prior to assuming the position of Library Services Program Officer.

DISCUSSION LEADERS AND RECORDERS

Designated System Areas

Area	Discussion Leaders	Recorders
Southeast	Gene Wright	Dorothy Skau
Capital	Liz Holloway	Gladys Ward
South Central	Lucille Arceneaux	Joy Wade
Southwest	Margie Lynch	Ruth Reedy
Central	Dorothy Hanks	Tom Jacques
Northwest	Doris Lessel	Ferne Turner
Northeast	Frances Flanders	Sammy Dyson

Type of Library

Type	Discussion Leaders	Recorders
Public	Agnes Harris	Linda Gates
Academic	Gerald Eberle	Edward Fontenette
School	Reva Chesson	Myra Voorhies
Special	Jane Lambremont	Harriet Lemann
State	Sallie Farrell	Betty Lou Roundtree

INSTITUTE OBSERVERS, RECORDERS AND RESOURCE PERSONNEL

Debora R. Abramson, Assistant State Librarian
Louisiana State Library

Kathryn J. Adams, Field Consultant
Louisiana State Library

Alex P. Allain, Trustee
St. Mary Parish Library

Julia Maye Avant
Shreveport, Louisiana

Alice Downs, Consultant on Elementary Libraries
State Department of Education

Betty M. Edgerton, Public Relations Director
Louisiana State Library

Sallie Farrell, State Librarian
Louisiana State Library

Florrinell F. Morton, Director
Louisiana State University Library School

Ida E. Raulins, Head, Reference Department
Louisiana State Library

Elizabeth S. Roundtree, Coordinator, Technical Services
Louisiana State Library

Dell Scholz, Head, Films and Recording Department
Louisiana State Library

Dorothy B. Skau, Librarian
U.S. Dept. of Agriculture Southern Utilization Research and Development Division

Murrell C. Wellman, Associate State Librarian
Louisiana State Library

INSTITUTE PARTICIPANTS

Luсille A. Arceneaux, Librarian, Lafayette Parish Library

Elizabeth P. Beamguard, Director, Alabama Public Library Service

Dora M. Beard, Assistant Librarian, Northeast Louisiana State College

Clarence W. Beasley, Jr., Administrative Librarian, St. John the Baptist Parish Library

Adele Bodker, Librarian, Tangipahoa Parish Library

Mary B. Brand, Librarian, Assumption Parish Library

Bettye R. Broome, Consultant, Mississippi Library Commission

Eva W. Bryan, Assistant Librarian, Jefferson Davis Parish Library

Jane C. Bryan, Director, Pike-Amite Library System, McComb, Mississippi

Joseph Butler, Jr., Associate Director, Francis T. Nicholls State College, Thibodaux, Louisiana

Evelyn B. Cammack, Librarian, East Carroll Parish Library

Ann M. Campbell, Assistant Librarian, St. Mary Parish Library

Reva J. Chesson, Supervisor of School and Media Program, Calcasieu Parish School Board

Frances D. Cole, Librarian, West Baton Rouge Parish Library

James S. Cookston, State Supervisor of School Libraries, Louisiana State Department of Education

Richard L. Colquette, Assistant Director for Technical Services, Louisiana State University Library

Eunice H. Cotton, Parish Librarian, Franklin and Caldwell Parishes

Elizabeth Ann Cross, Parish Librarian, Concordia Parish Library

Nelle C. Davidson, Head Librarian, New Orleans Baptist Theological Seminary Library

Earline M. Decoteau, Librarian, Ascension Parish Library

Sam A. Dyson, Director of Libraries, Louisiana Polytechnic Institute, Ruston, Louisiana

Gerard J. Eberle, Director, Louisiana State University at New Orleans Library

Bessie C. Elliott, Acting Librarian, Sabine Parish Library

Frances V. Flanders, Head Librarian, Ouachita Parish Public Library

Edward Fontenette, Associate Librarian, Southern University Library, Baton Rouge

Frank Francis, Jr., Associate Librarian, Prairie View A & M College, Prairie View, Texas

Cecil T. Gaddis, Librarian, LaSalle Parish Library

Lou A. Gamm, Circulation Librarian, Jefferson Parish Library Division

Linda F. Gates, Parish Librarian, St. James Parish Library

Ruby R. Gibson, Director, Libraries and Instructional Media, Beauregard Parish Schools

Mary Louise Giraud, Librarian, Lake Charles Public Library, Lake Charles, Louisiana

Edna C. Greer, Administrative Librarian, Claiborne Parish Library

Georgiana W. Greeson, Administrative Librarian, St. Charles Parish Library

Laura E. Griffith, Assistant to the Librarian, Ouachita Parish Library

Marguerite M. Hanchey, Head, Science Division, Louisiana State University Library

Dorothy M. Hanks, Assistant Professor of Library Science, Northwestern State College, Natchitoches, Louisiana

Peggy Harper, Assistant Law Librarian, Louisiana State University Law Library

Agnes A. Harris, Librarian, Union Parish Library

Clara S. Haupt, Parish Librarian, Terrebonne Parish Library

Clara Sue Hefley, Director, Statewide Survey of Resources in Louisiana Libraries

Mrs. J. M. Holloway, Parish Librarian, Pointe Coupee Parish Library

Harriet B. Hotard, Head Librarian, Charity Hospital School of Nursing Library

Elisabeth Huey, Librarian, Natchitoches Parish Library Board

David Lee Hunsucker, Assistant Librarian, Gaston College, Dallas, North Carolina

Betty B. Jackson, Monroe, Louisiana

Mary Alice Jackson, Librarian, West Carroll Parish Library

Bronislaw Janowski, Administrative Librarian, Evangeline Parish Library

Mary T. Janowski, Administrative Librarian, Allen Parish Library

Thomas F. Jacques, Coordinating Librarian, Rapides Parish Library

Lou Venia G. Jones, Administrative Librarian, Morehouse Parish Library

Nancy Litaker Khoury, Reference Librarian, Lake Charles Public Library, Lake Charles, Louisiana

Mary B. LaBorde, Librarian, Avoyelles Parish Library

Jane A. Lambremont, Librarian, Earl K. Long Memorial Hospital Library

Earl J. Lasworth, Assistant Director, University of Southwestern Louisiana Library

Ruth Lefkovits, Parish Librarian, Iberia Parish Library

Harriet M. Lemann, Librarian, International House, New Orleans

Doris Lessel, Administrative Librarian, Webster Parish Library

Margie R. Lynch, Parish Librarian, Calcasieu Parish Public Library

Odalie S. McDonald, State Supervisor of School Libraries, Louisiana State Department of Education

Kay W. McGinnis, Administrative Librarian, Gulf South Research Institute, Baton Rouge

Donald N. MacKenzie, Librarian, Northwestern State College of Louisiana

Peggy J. May, Coordinator of Consultant Services, Mississippi Library Commission

Vivian W. Maxey, Administrative Librarian, Winn Parish Library

Charles E. Miller, Associate Librarian, Tulane University Medical Library

Howell G. Mims, Intern, Department of Public Instruction, School Libraries Section, Raleigh, North Carolina

Mary M. Mitchell, Librarian, Richland Parish Library

Goldie G. Montgomery, Acquisitions Librarian, Southeastern Louisiana College Library, Hammond, Louisiana

Mendell D. Morgan, Assistant Director, Field Services Division, Texas State Library

Kathleen M. Owens, Assistant Librarian, Centenary College, Shreveport, Louisiana

Helen Palmer, Head, Humanities Division, Louisiana State University Library

Malcolm G. Parker, Head Librarian, Louisiana State University at Shreveport Library

Alice W. Porter, Librarian, Jennings, Louisiana

Mildred G. Ramsey, Head of Extension, East Baton Rouge Parish Library

Ruth C. Reedy, Materials Center Librarian, McNeese State College, Lake Charles, Louisiana

Juanita R. Rembert, Head Librarian, Shreve Memorial Library, Shreveport, Louisiana

John B. Richard, Head Librarian, Louisiana State University at Alexandria Library

Gerald J. Sarradet, Coordinator of Library Services, Jefferson Davis Parish School Board

Tillie A. Schenker, Librarian, East Baton Rouge Parish Library

Patricia M. Segleau, Parish Librarian, St. Bernard Parish Library

Margaret M. Shaffer, Assistant Librarian, Terrebonne Parish Library

Dorothy B. Skau, Librarian, U.S. Department of Agriculture Southern Utilization Research and Development Division Library

Hester B. Slocum, Head, Technical Services, New Orleans Public Library

Linda M. Smith, Assistant Librarian, Morehouse Parish Library

Hazel G. Sockrider, Parish Librarian, St. Martin Parish Library

Betty N. Sommer, Acting Librarian, Bossier-Red River Parish Libraries

H. Grady Spencer, Serials Librarian, Porter Library, Kansas State College of Pittsburg, Pittsburg, Kansas

Lilly F. Stewart, Librarian, Beauregard Parish Library

Ellis A. Stringer, Administrative Librarian, Catahoula Parish Library

Marion Taylor, Librarian, Rapides Parish Library

Lola C. Thompson, Librarian, St. Mary Parish Library

Chris F. Thomas, Executive Secretary, Louisiana Library Association

Ferne S. Turner, Supervisor and Librarian of Parish Instructional Center, Caddo Parish School System

Glenna K. Uhler, Parish Librarian, Iberville Parish Library

Bess L. Vaughan, Parish Librarian, Lincoln Parish Library

Myra Voorhies, Library Supervisor, East Baton Rouge Parish School System

Joy L. Wade, Administrative Librarian, Opelousas-Eunice Public Library, Opelousas, Louisiana

Margaret W. Walsworth, Parish Librarian, Vermilion Parish Library

Gladys S. Ward, Staff Librarian, Library Processing Center, East Baton Rouge Parish School Board

Eugene Wright, City Librarian, New Orleans Public Library